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### Free Trade Good Shell

#### Obama re-prioritizing free trade to appease republicans

Strassel 2013 (2-14-13, Kimberley A. Strassel is a member of Wall Street Journal Editorial Board, “The Obama Free-Trade Agenda, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324162304578304533741973160.html>)

Mr. Obama's promise in his Tuesday speech to make free trade a centerpiece of economic revival was one of the few moments that earned him Republican and business-community applause. Trade gurus were heartened by both the attention the president gave the subject, as well as the scope of his ambitions. Mr. Obama vowed to not only finish a long-lingering trade pact with trans-Pacific nations, but to kick off a far-reaching agreement with the European Union. This would be a remarkable turnaround for a White House that has up to now treated trade with thinly disguised disdain. The highlight of its trade agenda are three free-trade pacts—with South Korea, Panama and Colombia—that were signed in the Bush administration, and which the Obama White House took three years to get around to asking Congress to pass. Beyond that, Mr. Obama has shown little appetite for taking on his union and environmentalist base, which oppose free trade on principle.

#### Intervention and engagement results in selective economic action not global trade - leaders use nationalism to justify economic decisions

Costa 2013 (Anthony Costa - Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, “Selective engagement with the global economy, prioritizing growth, spurs inequality”, <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/nations-can-try-promotion-%E2%80%93-not-protectionism>)

National security arguments also prompt intervention, such as scrutiny by the US government of Chinese telecommunications firms, like Huawei and ZTE, to sell in the American market. Upset about the elimination of any French jobs, the French government threatened to nationalize ArcelorMittal units in France, owned by an Indian steel magnate, after he proposed closing two inactive blast furnaces. Not all states intervene, though, too often indifferent, even callous to the plight of their citizens. In fact, most states fail to govern their economies well in the face of challenges and opportunities emanating from the world economy. Only a few states have the capacity to intervene effectively. Today these include ambitious developing states such as Brazil, Russia, China and India, known as BRIC, and East Asian economies. These countries have a history of state-led development with global and regional political and economic ambitions in the midst of other powerful states. The concept of economic nationalism is used for selective engagement with the world economy. Rather than the orthodox notion of economic nationalism, defensive in nature and nation-centered, I offer a more dynamic understanding – economic nationalism in motion. This version, first proposed in the Review of International Political Economy, 2009, suggests that the practice is influenced by pragmatic considerations rather than ideology – akin to Deng Xiaoping’s proverbial cat that catches mice irrespective of its color – especially under fluid circumstances of economic growth, emerging competitive industries and, most importantly, as national capitalists mature. Earlier economic nationalism meant protection; today it’s promotion, though the basic motive for both is ensuring national economic interests. This ability to navigate changing circumstances and priorities pragmatically contributes to the dynamic movement of the practice of economic nationalism.

#### Free trade creates relations that foster peace and resolve conflict

Foulkes 2012 (“The Magic of Free Trade,” 10-22-12, <http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/the-magic-of-free-trade#axzz2YCcbjJVp>, SP)

What’s more, free trade among nations is a way to promote peaceful international relations. When individuals are free to trade across political boundaries, they are more likely to view “foreigners” positively. The mutual benefits of trade, in other words, can promote peace. Ricardo, one of the most influential economists of all time, was among the first to understand the great value of free trade. In his Principles of Political Economy and Taxation (1817) he summed up the benefits of free international trade nicely: Under a system of perfectly free commerce, each country naturally devotes its capital and labor to such employments as are most beneficial to each. This pursuit of individual advantage is admirably connected with the universal good of the whole. . . . [It] distributes labor most effectively and most economically; while, by increasing the general mass of productions, it diffuses general benefit, and binds together, by one common tie of interest and intercourse, the universal society of nations throughout the civilized world. Free trade gets a bad rap from domestic producers and protectionists of all sorts. But nothing is more important to a growing, dynamic economy than allowing the basic human right to freely and peacefully exchange with others.

### Free Trade Bad Shell

#### US protectionist policies now- growing trading partners prove

**Marantis**, Ambassador of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, **2013**

(Demetrios, “2013 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Barriers”, Office of the United States Trade Representative, March, <http://www.ustr.gov/sites/default/files/2013%20NTE.pdf>, accessed on 7/6/13, BT)4

In recent years, the United States has observed a growing trend among our trading partners to impose localization barriers to trade – measures designed to protect, favor, or stimulate domestic industries, service providers, or intellectual property at the expense of imported goods, services or foreign-owned or developed intellectual property. These measures may operate as disguised barriers to trade and unreasonably differentiate between domestic and foreign products, services, intellectual property, or suppliers. They can distort trade, discourage foreign direct investment and lead other trading partners to impose similarly detrimental measures. For these reasons, it has been longstanding U.S. trade policy to advocate strongly against localization barriers and encourage trading partners to pursue policy approaches that help their economic growth and competitiveness without discriminating against imported goods and services. USTR is chairing an interagency effort to develop and execute a more strategic and coordinated approach to address localization barriers. This year’s NTE continues the practice of identifying localization barriers to trade in the relevant barrier category in the report’s individual sections to assist these efforts and to inform the public on the scope and diversity of these practices.

#### U.S. economic engagement causes trade liberalization

**Donilon 2013**

(Tom, National Security Advisor in the Obama Administration, “The President's Free-Trade Path to Prosperity,” Wallstreet Journal, 4-15-13, 7-5-13, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323741004578420843565131294.html)//KC

International economic engagement has been a defining pillar of United States leadership and prosperity for decades. It helped turn former enemies into close allies and major trading partners. It forged an international economic architecture on the bedrock principles of fair competition, open markets, and rules-based trade and investment. It lowered economic barriers and made possible the rise of vibrant middle classes abroad and in America

#### Free trade hurts economy – kills jobs and exporting.

Sorscher 6-20-2013 (Stan Sorscher is on staff at Society for Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace SPEEA, “"Free Trade" Was Never Really About Trade” <https://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/06/20-10>)

If trade is good, then free trade must be better, right? So consider this old joke about "free trade." It's not free. It's not trade. Twenty years after NAFTA we can add that it doesn't work. It's bad for millions of workers, families and communities around the world. "Free trade" is not free. Our free trade policy encourages production to leave the country. We've lost millions of manufacturing jobs. More than 60,000 manufacturing plants were closed between 2000 and 2010 as production moved overseas. These costs are real. "Free trade" is not trade. Basically, trade is when each country makes things of value for export and gets things of comparable value in imports. In modern globalization, other countries manipulate their currencies, use tax strategies that distort exports and imports, and apply effective well-designed industrial policies to build manufacturing capacity. They export more products to us, and import fewer products from us. Our trade deficits since NAFTA are over $8 trillion. With trade deficits this large, we are not trading. We are letting other countries produce for us. We borrow, de-industrialize, and ultimately fail to capitalize on future production opportunities. That's not trade. That's getting picked clean.

#### Jobs are key to the economy- overall sustainability and growth

PAUL POST [columnist for The Saratogian- NY based newspaper] ¶ Experts: Economy slowly healing, but jobs are key to recovery¶ January 11, 2013¶ <http://www.saratogian.com/articles/2013/01/11/news/doc50f0cc12ac929020135797.txt>

Jobs and consumer confidence are important keys to continued recovery, a pair of economic analysts told area business leaders Friday. Gary Keith, M&T Bank regional economist, and Bouchey Financial Group Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Martin Shields addressed 150 Capital Region business people at a luncheon hosted by Saratoga County Chamber of Commerce and Saratoga Economic Development Corp. at the Holiday Inn. Saratoga County leads upstate New York in economic vitality, but local officials must remain vigilant to keep the area on its path of success, they said. “What goes in one direction for a while isn’t inevitable,” Keith said. “There are others out there that are very envious and strategizing, as we speak, how they can get a piece of this action.” Shields added, “We can’t be complacent. We have to continually reinvent ourselves.” GlobalFoundries announced plans this week for a $2 billion research and development center at Luther Forest Technology Campus that will create another 1,000 jobs by the end of 2014. “The wages that are coming here are higher wages,” Shields said. In addition to $200 million in new payroll, Saratoga County home sales jumped 17.5 percent in 2012, Keith said. Also, the region outperforms many areas in exporting goods to so-called BRIC countries — Brazil, Russia, India, China — whose economies are flourishing, Shields said. However, there is still an overall lack of consumer household spending, which he said accounts for 70 percent of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product. Partially, this is because there are 3.7 million fewer jobs in America now than before the recession started. “If we can create jobs, we can create economic growth,” Keith said.

#### Economic collapse cause extinction

Daguzan 2010 (Citing Jean Francois, PhD and Senior Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, "Economic crisis threatens existence of human beings" November 26, 2010, Right Vision News, pg online @ lexisnexis)

The financial and economic crisis being faced by the world is in fact a human catastrophe as it may threatenthe well-being and existence of human beings in the globe, said Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan, senior research fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, France.¶ ¶ He was speaking at a roundtable discussion on ‘The Strategic Consequences of World Financial and Economic Crisis’ organised by the South Asia Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI) here on Wednesday. Former ambassador Tasawur Naqvi conducted the proceedings.¶ ¶ Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan said that the crisis could lead to violence. Every effort should be made to control it as it may lead to risky and dangerous situations. He said that the balance of power had already changed.¶ ¶ He said that if economic crisis is compared with 9/11 and invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, the World Trade Centre debacle seemed to be a contingent affair. The financial crisis to him was like a nuclear war, which is tilting the balance of power in the world. He said that an amount of $50,000 billion went to the aid of developing nations. He noted the impact of the snowballing crisis on stock exchanges and investment potential of different countries. He said that the crisis also affected stability of nations by impacting equities and stock exchanges.¶ ¶ He said that the war in currencies is the last impact of the crisis in an age of artificial monetary powers of currencies, which would provoke and continue with economic crises within countries. He said that it is rebalancing the power politics in the world. He enumerated Southeast Asia’s economies facing problems in 1988 when China was big, but not enough to become the lone competitor of the west.

# Uniqueness – Country Specific

### US pursuing free trade agreements – through WTO

#### US Complying with WTO in status quo- aircraft dispute proves

**USTR, 2012**

(“Reporter Memo: United States Complies with World Trade Organization Ruling in Aircraft Dispute”, Office of the United States Trade Representative, September, <http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/press-releases/2012/september/US-complies-wto-ruling-aircraft>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) today submitted the attached notification to the World Trade Organization (WTO) Dispute Settlement Body detailing the United States’ timely compliance with the WTO’s recommendations in the large civil aircraft dispute with the European Union (EU) related to U.S. government subsidies to Boeing. The United States’ deadline to comply with the rulings and recommendations in this case is today, September 23, 2012.USTR has been working extensively over the last six months with all of the government entities affected by the March 23, 2012 ruling in this case – including NASA, the Department of Defense, the State of Washington, and the City of Wichita – to ensure full compliance with the United States’ WTO obligations.In a related dispute regarding the European Union’s subsidies to Airbus, the WTO found that the EU provided more than $18 billion in subsidized financing to Airbus. In the EU’s case against the United States, the WTO found $3-4 billion in subsidies to Boeing – which was mostly in the form of funding for public research. A WTO panel is currently hearing the case against the EU for its lack of compliance with the June 1, 2011 ruling.

#### US working within WTO Organizations now

**View Point, 2013**

(“Obama Proposes Plurilateral WTO Talks to Liberalize Green Goods, Services”, Inside US Trade, June 27, <http://www.other-news.info/2013/07/the-us-view-point/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

As part of his comprehensive plan for addressing climate change that was unveiled on June 25, President Obama announced the United States will work with other World Trade Organization members to launch new plurilateral trade negotiations aimed at achieving free trade in environmental goods.Obama’s plan would also seek the liberalization of environmental services in the ongoing negotiations for a plurilateral Trade in International Services Agreement (TISA).This push will build on past work in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, according to a new report issued by the president. APEC members, including the U.S. and China, pledged in 2011 to reduce tariffs on 54 environmental goods to 5 percent or less by 2015, but support for such an initiative in the WTO has varied.“The U.S. will work with trading partners to launch negotiations at the World Trade Organization towards global free trade in environmental goods, including clean energy technologies such as solar, wind, hydro and geothermal,” according to the president’s new climate action plan.In the coming year, the U.S. will work to secure the participation in this new initiative of countries accounting for 90 percent of global trade in environmental goods, the plan adds.The list of 54 environmental goods developed by APEC “will serve as a foundation for a global agreement in the WTO, with participating countries expanding the scope by adding products of interest.”With the Doha round effectively stalled, the public call by the White House for a new “green” goods plurilateral initiative further underscores the fact that the U.S. sees plurilateral negotiations involving only willing WTO members as a more viable way to advance trade liberalization in Geneva.

<http://www.other-news.info/2013/07/the-us-view-point/>

### US pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral/Regional trade agreements

#### Protectionism decrease now

**Xinhua, 2013**

(“Xi, Obama reaffirm opposition to trade protectionism”, China Daily, June 9, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2013xivisit/2013-06/09/content_16598513.htm>, accessed on 7/6/13, BT)

Chinese President Xi Jinping and his US counterpart Barack Obama on Saturday reaffirmed their commitment to trade and investment liberalization, and opposition to trade protectionism, said Chinese State Councilor Yang Jiechi. During their second meeting at Sunnylands estate, California, the two leaders devoted much of their talks to economic ties, which they agreed have vast space and huge potential for further growth, Yang told reporters.The two sides also agreed to maintain coordination and cooperation under the frameworks like the Group of 20, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, improve global economic governance, and jointly promote the strong, sustainable and balanced growth of global economy.They vowed to exert the functions of existing mechanisms such as the China-US Strategic and Economic Dialogue, China-US Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade, and the China-US Governors Forum to enhance policy coordination and pragmatic cooperation.Both sides hailed the recently-held 9th round of negotiations on a bilateral investment accord and agreed to create fair, transparent and stable policy frameworks for mutual investment. The Chinese side hopes that Washington will provide a fair environment for Chinese enterprises investing in the United States. They also agreed to expand trade and economic ties at local levels. On trade frictions, both leaders agreed that dialogue and cooperation should serve as the way to handle such issues.The Chinese side said the RMB yuan exchange rate is approaching the equilibrium segment, and Beijing will continue to pursue reform of the RMB exchange rate formation mechanism.The Chinese side also pointed out that the RMB exchange rate is not the cause of the China-US trade imbalance.Before heading into the meeting, the two leaders took a walk at the picturesque Sunnylands, a 200-acre (81-hectare) Annenberg estate in Rancho Mirage, California. The two presidents held their first meeting and had a working dinner Friday, exchanging views on international and regional issues of common concern. Xi arrived in California Thursday after wrapping up a three-nation Latin America tour.

#### Increase in bilateral agreements in the status quo

Sutherland 2013 (Peter Sutherland, “The Bilateral Threat to Free Trade - WTO has a credibility problem”, Former Director General of GATT, WTO, Co-chair of High-level Expert Group on Trade, set up by UK, German, Turkish, and Indonesian governments to examine world trading system, 1-20-13, <http://www.neurope.eu/kn/article/bilateral-threat-free-trade-wto-has-credibility-problem>)

In fact, what we have seen in recent years is an increasing rush to bilateral agreements by the major trading countries and blocs. This has apparently consumed virtually all of their attention. The WTO has been marginalized, and even what has already been achieved in the incomplete Doha Round appears unlikely to be delivered in a final agreement in the foreseeable future.

#### US pursuing free trade agreement with EU- Transatlantic trade and investment partnership proves

**Clancy**, Spokesman for trade European Commission Brussels, **2013**

(John, “Europe and US enter trade talks to an equal footing”, European Voice, July 3, <http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/imported/europe-and-us-enter-trade-talks-on-an-equal-footing/77772.aspx>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Let me begin with the upcoming negotiations with the United States. If Europe and the US were really drifting apart, we would have never launched negotiations for a transatlantic trade and investment partnership (TTIP). It is as simple as that. To map out our common ambitions, we created a joint EU-US high-level working group. Its findings confirmed our belief in the advantages of further strengthening our ties with the US. The TTIP presents a real opportunity for growth and is expected to create hundreds of thousands of new jobs. It is simply misguided to think that we are entering these talks on anything but an equal footing with our American partners. As the largest economy in the world (yes, we still are – even if it is rarely mentioned), we have a strong voice in any negotiation we enter into. We will stand up for Europe's interests and make sure we achieve real benefits for people across Europe.

#### US seeking economic relations with EU- TTIP proves

**Jasper, 2013**

(William, “Obama, Cameron, Barroso Push EU-US Merger at G8 Ireland Summit”, New American, June 18, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/15739-obama-cameron-barroso-push-eu-us-merger-at-g8-ireland-summit>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

President Barack Obama, in Lough Erne, Northern Ireland, for the G8 Summit, joined European leaders in pushing the proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), a vast scheme for intertwining the economies and political structures of Europe and the United States. (See our detailed exposé of the TTIP, "Secretly Trading Away Our Independence.")British Prime Minister David Cameron opened the press conference with promises that the new “trade partnership” would “fire up our economies and drive growth and prosperity around the world,” a common claim that has accompanied virtually every so-called trade agreement; but the reality has never matched the hype. Likewise for the assertion that it would produce millions of new jobs.

**TTIP at the top of Obama’s priority**

**Jasper, 2013**

(William, “Obama, Cameron, Barroso Push EU-US Merger at G8 Ireland Summit”, New American, June 18, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/15739-obama-cameron-barroso-push-eu-us-merger-at-g8-ireland-summit>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

**“We intend to move forward fast.” — Barroso**. European Commission President José Manuel Barroso followed in a similar vein, announcing, “We intend to move forward fast”:Today is a special day for the relation between the European Union and the United States. Today we announce we will start negotiations of a comprehensive Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership agreement.Very frankly, two years ago, very few would have bet that today we’d be in the position to launch negotiations of an ambitious European Union-United States free trade agreement. And when the teams of the European Commission and United States will meet for the first round on the negotiations next month, it will be the start of a joint undertaking of real strategic importance….We intend to move forward fast. We can say that neither of us will give up content for the sake of speed, but we intend to make rapid progress. I’d rather see the core challenge, moving our regulatory regimes closer, and addressing the harmful effect of behind-the-border trade barriers....President Obama (see video below) told reporters:I’m pleased to join these leaders to announce the launch of negotiations on a new trade agreement that will help us do just that — the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, also known as TTIP…. I can tell you that it has been warmly received in the United States as well, both in our Congress and in our business community. And that broad support, on both sides of the Atlantic, will help us work through some of the tough issues that have already been mentioned…. So this Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership is going to be a priority of mine and my administration. It is important that we get it right — and that means resisting the temptation to downsize our ambitions or avoid tough issues just for the sake of getting a deal.

#### US seeking trade partnership with Mexico –TTP proves

**Petras, 2013**

(Professor James, “Washington’s “Dual Imperial Strategy” in Latin America: Breakdown of the Columbia-Venezuela – FARC Peace Process”, Global Research, June 7, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/washingtons-dual-imperial-strategy-in-latin-america-breakdown-of-the-colombia-venezuela-farc-peace-process/5338107>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Washington has devised a dual strategy toward Latin America .  This involves a new set of ambitious imperial initiatives designed to undermine the principal anti-imperialist governments ( Venezuela ), social movements and armed insurgency (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia), while dismantling Latin America-centered integration and regional alliances, such as ALBA, Petro-Caribe, UNASUR and MERCOSUR.  At the same time the US seeks to establish an alternative US-centered  ‘integration scheme’ through the Latin America and Asia-the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which encourages closer ties among neo-liberal states, like Mexico, Colombia, Peru and Chile with their energy and mining sector-dependent development strategies.

#### US-EU bilateral trade talks now- TTIP proves

**Bridges Weekly, 2013**

(“EU, US Formally Launch Trade Talks at G-8 Summit”, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, June, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/bridgesweekly/169781/>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Washington and Brussels have officially kicked off negotiations for a bilateral trade and investment deal, announcing the news on Monday during the annual Group of 8 summit in Lough Erne, Northern Ireland. The decision comes just days after EU trade ministers signed off on a mandate for the bilateral talks, following prolonged internal arguing among the bloc’s member states that had put the launch date in doubt.“I always said that the whole point of this meeting in Lough Erne is to fire up our economies and drive growth and prosperity around the world - to do things that make a real difference to people’s lives,” UK Prime Minister David Cameron said in announcing the news. “And there is no more powerful way to achieve that than by boosting trade.”The two sides will hold their first round of talks in Washington next month. They have said that they aim to conclude the negotiations for such a deal - known formally as the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) - by late next year.The EU and US currently have the world’s largest trading relationship, with bilateral trade hitting US$2.7 billion in goods and services a day, according to 2012 **estimates**. Since tariffs between the two partners are already low, many say that the real gains will come from harmonising regulations and standards and resolving other “behind-the-border” differences.

#### US seeking bilateral relations- multiple countries prove

**Schneider, 2013**

(Howard, “U.S. trade representative sees China economic slowdown a potential boost to reform”, The Washington Post, June 21, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/froman-sees-china-economic-slowdown-a-potential-boost-to-reformfroman-sees-china-economic-slowdown-a-potential-boost-to-reformfroman-sees-china-economic-slowdown-a-potential-boost-to-reform/2013/06/21/cec1aa3a-da9e-11e2-a9f2-42ee3912ae0e_story.html>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Economic tensions emerging in China should push the new government to more quickly open the country’s economy and make other changes advocated by the United States, incoming U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman said Friday.China’s new leaders are “focused on a concern that the Chinese economy might be slowing and what types of reforms they might need to pursue,” Froman said. Many of those changes, including a gradual liberalization of the financial sector and trying to boost the spending power of Chinese families, “would have positive implications for bilateral economic relations” and U.S. trade, Froman said following his swearing in to the ambassador-level job. His comments come amid concern about possible slowing growth and financial-sector trouble in China spilling over to the global economy, which is poorly positioned to absorb a big shock.Sparring about economic issues reached a high pitch between the two countries during last year’s presidential election but has ebbed as President Obama and new Chinese leader Xi Jinping forge a relationship.Froman said the United States would continue filing enforcement actions against China as needed — none have been brought at the World Trade Organization since the election — but added that economic forces, from rising wages to slowing global demand for its exports, are probably pushing the country toward changes long advocated by the United States and others. Froman’s shift from the White House, where he served on the National Security Council as Obama’s adviser on international economic issues, puts him in charge of what has become a newly intricate set of issues.Free-trade talks between the United States and Europe will start next month while such talks are underway between the United States and a dozen Asian and Pacific rim countries, including Japan, Canada and Mexico. Separate talks, coordinated out of the U.S. mission to the WTO in Geneva, aim to open global trade in services, expand the list of freely traded technology products, and do away with cumbersome customs and procedures that complicate the flow of goods.

### US pursuing protectionist policies – general

#### US protectionist policies now- growing trading partners prove

**Marantis**, Ambassador of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, **2013**

(Demetrios, “2013 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Barriers”, Office of the United States Trade Representative, March, <http://www.ustr.gov/sites/default/files/2013%20NTE.pdf>, accessed on 7/6/13, BT)4

In recent years, the United States has observed a growing trend among our trading partners to impose localization barriers to trade – measures designed to protect, favor, or stimulate domestic industries, service providers, or intellectual property at the expense of imported goods, services or foreign-owned or developed intellectual property. These measures may operate as disguised barriers to trade and unreasonably differentiate between domestic and foreign products, services, intellectual property, or suppliers. They can distort trade, discourage foreign direct investment and lead other trading partners to impose similarly detrimental measures. For these reasons, it has been longstanding U.S. trade policy to advocate strongly against localization barriers and encourage trading partners to pursue policy approaches that help their economic growth and competitiveness without discriminating against imported goods and services. USTR is chairing an interagency effort to develop and execute a more strategic and coordinated approach to address localization barriers. This year’s NTE continues the practice of identifying localization barriers to trade in the relevant barrier category in the report’s individual sections to assist these efforts and to inform the public on the scope and diversity of these practices.

#### US privacy laws are interfering with trade efforts threatening protectionism from other countries

Maloof 7-2-13 (F. Michael Maloof is a former Defense Department official who worked as an analyst in a controversial Pentagon policy outfit—sometimes referred to as the Office of Special Plans “nsa snooping threatens free-trade talks”, <http://www.wnd.com/2013/07/nsa-snooping-threatens-free-trade-talks/?cat_orig=money>)

Other E.U. policymakers also now are expressing concern that the ongoing talks for the free trade agreement between the U.S. and the E.U. may be in jeopardy. They want full clarification from U.S. officials on the extent of the NSA eavesdropping, an episode which is dealing a “blow for the relations between the E.U. and the United States,” according to European Parliament President Martin Schulz. Even before the latest revelations when Snowden first revealed that personal data of citizens in Europe were being monitored, members of the European Parliament called for tougher online regulations given the ongoing E.U. discussions with the U.S. on the transatlantic trade talks. Schulz said that at the time he had spoken to U.S. officials, he had voiced concern that such monitoring of European citizens’ electronic communications was a “very serious blow for trust and certainty” if this proves true. “If these reports are true, then it is abhorrent,” said Luxembourg’s Foreign Minister Jean Asselborn. “It would seem that the secret services have gotten out of control. The U.S. should monitor their own secret services rather than their allies.” “The U.S. justifies everything as being part of the fight against terrorism,” he added. “But the E.U. and its diplomats are not terrorists. We need a guarantee from the very highest level that it stops immediately.”

#### Protectionist trend on the rise

The Bangkok Post 7-3-13 (Neglect Triggers Global Trust Deficit – LN)

For example, after spending decades encouraging developing countries to integrate their economies into the global market, advanced countries now balk at trade openness. Indeed, despite pledges not to erect trade barriers after the global economic crisis, more than 800 new protectionist measures were introduced from late 2008 through 2010. G8 countries, the supposed champions of the global free-trade agenda that dominates the World Trade Organisation, accounted for the lion's share of these measures. Some question the leadership ability of Brics. But many emerging markets are already leading by example on important issues like the need to shift global financial flows from debt toward equity. Mexico, for example, recently adopted \_ ahead of schedule \_ the changes in capital requirements for banks recommended by the Third Basel Accord (Basel III), in order to reduce leverage and increase stability. For too long, developed countries have clung to their outsize influence in the international financial institutions, even as their fiscal fitness has dwindled. By ignoring the advice that they so vehemently dispensed to the developing world, they brought the world economy to its knees. Now, they refuse to fulfil their promises of global cooperation.

#### Free Trade on the decline - modeling

**Lindsey**, senior fellow at the CATO institute and director of its Center for Trade Policy Studies, **2012**

(Brink, “Free Trade Nationalism”, CATO institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/free-trade-nationalism>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

In other words, protectionist countries have changed their policies in order to catch up economically with more open countries. It follows that the most important thing the United States can do to foster liberalization elsewhere is to set a good example. Indeed, more than anything else, a consistent and principled commitment to open markets on the part of the world’s largest and most prosperous economy would enhance the prospects of free trade around the world. Is there any room left for international negotiations and institutions? I believe there is. Trade agreements can strengthen the political case for freer trade at home by adding the gains from freer trade abroad to the calculus. Also, even when markets are opened unilaterally, converting those reforms into international obligations can serve as a safeguard against backsliding. But to secure these advantages, free traders should first make their case at the national level. The polestar of sound trade policy ought always to be the American interest in free markets at home. Many conservative free traders are doubtless reluctant to abandon tried and true approaches for something as novel as unilateral free trade. But the fact is that what may have worked during the Cold War is no longer working. Free trade and conservatism are increasingly at odds, and it’s a conflict that threatens both causes. Free-trade nationalism, as strange as it may sound, provides the way out.

### US pursuing protectionist policies – Agriculture

#### The U.S. is protectionist on sugar now- proves AG protectionism is locked in

George F. Will [writes for the Washington Post Writers Group]¶ June 10, 2013¶ George F. Will commentary: Americans stuck with sugar protectionism¶ <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/editorials/2013/06/10/americans-stuck-with-sugar-protectionism.html>

The steamboat conveying Andrew Jackson up the Ohio River toward his tumultuous 1829 inauguration had brooms lashed to its bow, symbolizing Old Hickory’s vow to clean up Washington. But sweeping out Washington’s Augean stables, like painting the Golden Gate Bridge, is steady work, so steady it never ends. Neither do the policies that cosset sugar producers.¶ These immortal measures just received the Senate’s benediction because they illustrate the only law Washington can be counted on to respect. It is the law of dispersed costs but concentrated benefits.¶ The provisions by which Washington transfers wealth from 316 million American consumers to a few thousand sugar producers are part of a “temporary” commodity support program created during the Great Depression. Not even the New Deal could prolong the Depression forever. It ended. But sugar protectionism is forever. The Senate recently voted 54-45 against even mild reforms of the baroque architecture of protections for producers of sugar cane and sugar beets.¶ The government guarantees up to 85 percent of the U.S. sugar market for U.S.-produced sugar. The remaining portion of the market is allocated for imports from particular countries at a preferential tariff rate. Minimum prices are guaranteed for sugar from cane and beets. Surplus sugar — meaning that which U.S. producers cannot profitably sell — is bought by the government and sold at a loss to producers of ethanol, another program whose irrationalities are ubiquitous.

#### US protectionist on agriculture now- WTO study concludes

Brian Wingfield [reporting for Bloomberg News]¶ [Trade Protectionism Seen as EU Joins U.S. for Trade Talks](http://antidumping.vn/news/2013-06-19/trade-protectionism-seen-eu-joins-us-trade-talks)¶ June 19, 2013¶ <http://antidumping.vn/news/2013-06-19/trade-protectionism-seen-eu-joins-us-trade-talks>

The world’s largest economies are adopting policies to impede global commerce as growth remains sluggish, the World Trade Organization said in a study released as the leaders of the Group of Eight industrial nations met.¶ ¶ During the past seven months, members of the expanded Group of 20 nations implemented 109 measures to restrict trade, down from 124 actions to limit commerce in the same period a year earlier, according to the report today from the Geneva-based WTO.¶ ¶ “To overcome protectionist threats and to prevent a self-destructive lapse into economic nationalism, G-20 economies need to refocus their attention on reinforcing the multilateral trading system,” it said.¶ ¶ The U.S. and 27-nation EU are set to announce the start of negotiations soon for the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, which would create a free-trade zone with about $28 trillion in annual economic output, the largest in history. The US and EU in recent months have sparred with China over its support for goods including solar-energy equipment.¶ ¶ The trade-restrictive measures cited in the WTO report include policies to stop imports from being sold below their production costs, as well as tariff increases. The most protected goods include electrical machinery, agricultural products and mechanical appliances, it said.

#### US cotton lobby causing protectionist policies as backlash in Ag sector

Smith 2013 (Vincent Smith, Professor Montana State University, The Hill, “Ignoring Trade Commitments and Trade Relations only Hurts our Credibility”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/294455-ignoring-trade-commitments-and-trade-relations-only-hurts-our-credibility>)

The U.S. cotton lobby might be a poster-child when it comes to seeking subsidies that are likely to violate US trade agreements, but the disease is endemic in the industry. Last week, even the American Farm Bureau, which has had a long history of advocating for free markets, came out with a new “STAX for all” farm bill proposal. In their current Farm Bill rent seeking activities, peanuts, rice and cotton farmers have sought a new Price Loss Coverage price support program that would likely trigger large subsidies, even though crop prices are at near record levels for many commodities. Corn, soybeans and wheat organizations have been seeking an expanded and potentially very lucrative “shallow loss” program. Both proposals have been included in at least one of the Senate and House agricultural committee farm bills. Why do these proposals all pose problems for U.S. international trade relations? First, as new subsidy programs, they undercut the credibility of the U.S. as a proponent for free trade in all goods and services. Second, all of the new farm lobby proposals (STAX, shallow loss, higher price supports, and the most widely used and heavily subsidized crop revenue insurance products) increase subsidies when international agricultural commodity prices fall. As a result, they create the potential for new WTO price suppression complaints from dozens of countries on over twenty agricultural commodities, ranging from major commodities such as corn and cotton to smaller acreage commodities such as canola, sunflower, chickpeas and lentils. Third, the subsidies associated with the proposed shallow loss and price support programs are potentially so large that they could cause the US to violate its commitments to limit spending on production distorting farm programs (its “amber box aggregate measures of support). All this means that other countries are likely to bring more complaints against the U.S. and win the right to impose “countervailing measures”. These could legitimately include new tariffs on any U.S. agricultural exports, manufactured goods, or services. Alternatively, the U.S. can try to buy complainants off with taxpayer dollars to improve wheat production in Canada and Australia, and wine production in France and Austria, as well as cotton production in Brazil. But most seriously, perhaps, as long as congressional agricultural committees persist in ignoring U.S. trade commitments and trade relations, the U.S. government will continue to lack credibility in negotiations that open and expand new markets for all U.S. products and protect U.S. intellectual property from international theft.

**US pursues protectionist policies in sugar now**

**National Post, 2013**

(“Sweet Deal for Sugar Industry”, National Post, June 9, <http://www.nationalpost.com/opinion/columnists/story.html?id=3b0b3cb8-27b4-48ec-b75d-183d1fbbd367&p=1>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Luther Markwart will undoubtedly go down as a god in the annals of U. S. lobbying history. The chairman of the American Sugar Alliance was a driving force behind one of the sweetest feats of protectionism ever to come out of Washington, probably the world. Mr. Markwart managed to clinch an agreement that guarantees U. S. producers 85% of the domestic U. S. sugar market, part of a U. S. farm bill that passed last month. There are only 146,000 people involved in the entire U. S. sugar industry. The farm bill, enacted by Congress over a presidential veto, is a US$300-billion extravaganza of protectionist insanity that increases farm spending by $20-billion at a time of record crop prices and income. With Canada continuing to resist any changes to its own protectionist farm marketing boards and Europe steadfastly trying protect its farm interests, any meaningful reform of global agricultural policy remains a pipe dream as crunch time looms on global trade talks this summer. In an interview, Mr. Markwart was modest about his accomplishment. "Until you get reforms in international production and trade, you simply have to have it," he said. Trade experts had other words for it, such as "illegal." "I'm not a trade lawyer, but my reading of world trade law would suggest that is illegal," said Sallie James, a policy analyst with the Washington-based Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies. No way, Mr. Markwart says. "It doesn't violate anything under NAFTA, CAFTA any of our other bilateral trade agreements or WTO," he said, pointing out that the United States is the world's second-biggest importer of sugar after Russia. The deal is nifty. The United States will not restrict imports. The government will simply buy up the surplus and sell it at auction to ethanol producers, likely at a loss.

**Free Trade Agreements include protectionism in agriculture – Senator Baucus proves**

**Reuters, 2013**

(“U.S.-EU deal must tackle agricultural barriers: Senator Baucus”, Reuters, March 4, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/04/us-usa-trade-baucus-idUSBRE92317S20130304>, accessed on 7/6/13, BT)

"As chairman of the committee overseeing U.S. trade, I will support a deal only if it gives America's producers the opportunity to compete in the world's biggest market," Senator Max Baucus, a Montana Democrat, wrote in the Financial Times.With the U.S.-EU trade talks expected to begin by June, Baucus also urged President Barack Obama, a fellow Democrat, to replace outgoing U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk with an experienced leader who has "proved mastery of the details of trade negotiations."Baucus aides did not reply to a request for more detail, including whether he had intended to discourage Obama from picking White House acting White House budget director Jeffrey Zients, who some see as a top candidate for USTR even though he does not have a trade background.U.S. farm groups, in a letter on Monday to the U.S. Trade Representative's office, also underscored their insistence that the proposed U.S.-EU agreement "cover all significant barriers in a single comprehensive agreement."The 64 groups said they objected to the idea contained in a U.S.-EU working group report the pact could "evolve over time" by eliminating most barriers to trade and investment and setting up a mechanism to address more contentious issues.Obama announced plans to negotiate a free trade agreement with the European Union last month in his annual State of the Union speech, following more than a year of preliminary talks between the two sides. Formal negotiations are expected to begin by June.The proposed "Transatlantic Trade and Investment Pact" would be the biggest trade deal since the World Trade Organization was founded 20 years ago, and Baucus wrote that "it must be treated as a top priority for the U.S. administration and Congress." Baucus, like many lawmakers from farm states, long has been frustrated by European restrictions on agricultural practices approved in the United States, such as the planting of genetically modified crops and the use of the feed additive ractopamine to produce leaner beef, pork and turkey meat."I heard that there is some interest on the European side in pursuing a limited agreement that would set aside tough issues in order to conclude a quick deal on the easier ones. That is a recipe for failure," Baucus said. "Any bilateral trade and investment agreement must be comprehensive and address the full range of barriers to U.S. goods and services if it is to receive broad, bipartisan congressional support," he said.Baucus said the Finance Committee would meet in coming days "to discuss how we can work together to accelerate" the U.S.-EU talks.EU Trade Commissioner Karel De Gucht on Saturday said resolving differences in regulatory approaches to food and other goods would be the most difficult part of the U.S.-EU talks."But if we are pragmatic, creative and realistic it will certainly not be impossible," De Gucht said in a speech at the Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School Of Government.

#### Sugar Protectionism low now- Seneate vote proves

**Will, 2013**

(George, “Sugar Protectionism sour for Americans”, Pal-Item, June 8, <http://www.pal-item.com/article/20130609/OPINION/306090001/Sugar-protectionism-sour-Americans>, accessed on 7/6/13, BT)

The steamboat conveying Andrew Jackson up the Ohio River toward his tumultuous 1829 inauguration had brooms lashed to its bow, symbolizing Old Hickory’s vow to clean up Washington.But sweeping out Washington’s Augean stables, like painting the Golden Gate Bridge, is steady work, so steady it never ends. Neither do the policies that cosset sugar producers.These immortal measures just received the Senate’s benediction because they illustrate the only law Washington can be counted on to respect. It is the law of dispersed costs but concentrated benefits.The provisions by which Washington transfers wealth from 316 million American consumers to a few thousand sugar producers are part of a “temporary” commodity support program created during the Great Depression. Not even the New Deal could prolong the Depression forever. It ended. But sugar protectionism is forever. The Senate recently voted 54-45 against even mild reforms of the baroque architecture of protections for producers of sugar cane and sugar beets.The government guarantees up to 85 percent of the U.S. sugar market for U.S.-produced sugar. The remaining portion of the market is allocated for imports from particular countries at a preferential tariff rate. Minimum prices are guaranteed for sugar from cane and beets. Surplus sugar — meaning that which U.S. producers cannot profitably sell — is bought by the government and sold at a loss to producers of ethanol, another program whose irrationalities are ubiquitous.All this probably means $3.7 billion in higher sugar costs. It also means scores of thousands of lost jobs as manufacturers of candy and products with significant sugar content move jobs to countries where they can pay the much lower world price of sugar.The big companies like Mars and Hershey can locate plants around the world. The hundreds of family-owned American candy companies cannot.

### US pursuing protectionist policies – Energy

#### US protectionist now in energy sector- GHGs

Shawn McCarthy [Globe and Mail energy reporter] April 30, 2013¶ Canada warned about U.S. energy protectionism¶ <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/canada-warned-about-us-energy-protectionism/article11630534/>

Canada needs to beware U.S. energy protectionism – including policies that insist this country adopt greenhouse gas emission regulations for its oil and gas industry while giving U.S. and offshore producers a free pass, says former Conservative environment minister Jim Prentice.¶ In a speech delivered in Halifax on Tuesday, Mr. Prentice cited U.S. renewable energy strategies that discriminate against Canadian hydroelectric power from Quebec and Labrador, as well as proposed low carbon fuel standards, like the one in California that disadvantages oil sands companies while exempting heavy oil producers in that state.¶ “Canada must continue to fight for a continental energy marketplace that is free of national and subnational impediments – interventions by government, while well meaning, are nevertheless potentially damaging and counterproductive,” said Mr. Prentice, now deputy chairman of Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.¶ In an interview, he sided with TransCanada Corp., which complained recently that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is urging Washington to work with Alberta and Canada to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the oil sands as part of the review process for the Keystone XL pipeline.¶ TransCanada said the EPA recommendation would amount to an infringement of sovereignty.¶ Mr. Prentice also expressed concern if the pressure to regulate flows only one way.¶ “It’s an infringement of sovereignty if the Americans are telling us to [cut oil industry emissions] and they’re not doing anything,” he said in the interview.

#### US energy protectionism now- no bilateral trade checks

The Canadian Press [Canadian news outlet]¶ , April 30, 2013¶ Canada must fight U.S. protectionism in energy sector: Ex-MP¶ <http://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/canada-must-fight-u-s-protectionism-in-energy-sector-ex-mp-1.1260236>

But he said Canadians can't take access to the U.S. market for granted.¶ Rather, Prentice warned that they should be vigilant about signs of protectionism coming in the form of low carbon fuel standards or regional requirements to use specific amounts of renewable energy.¶ "Canada must continue to fight for a continental energy marketplace that is free of national and sub-national impediments. Interventions by government, while well meaning, are nevertheless potentially damaging and counter-productive," he said.¶ "Even green protectionism is protectionism nonetheless."¶ If U.S. markets stay open to Canadian products, Prentice says the Canadian energy sector stands to profit handsomely, not just from oil and gas sales but also from hydro-electricity.¶ Prentice -- who stepped down as environment minister in November, 2010 -- has been a strong advocate of fully developing the energy potential of the Lower Churchill River so that Atlantic Canada can define itself as a major exporter of clean electricity.¶ He acknowledged that cheap and abundant natural gas in North America means volatility for Canadian oil and hydro-electricity exporters. But as heavy users of electricity look for ways to wean themselves off fossil fuels, Prentice believes the long-term potential for hydro is promising -- as long as U.S. markets stay open.¶ In order to ensure that subnational energy requirements don't get in Canada's way, Prentice proposes setting up bi-national working groups "with real teeth" that would establish policies for both countries.

#### US is pursuing protectionist policies on energy – wind and solar prove

Foulkes 2012 (“The Magic of Free Trade,” 10-22-12, <http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/the-magic-of-free-trade#axzz2YCcbjJVp>, SP)

Despite its clear advantages, free trade is always under attack by those who would directly benefit from its restriction. Currently, the Obama administration is trying hard to promote “clean energy,” such as wind and solar power, in the United States. Those industries are receiving big subsidies and are asking for more. At the same time, ironically, the administration is slapping tariffs on Chinese solar cells and wind towers, saying they unfairly benefit from Chinese government subsidies. Domestic solar and wind-tower companies say they cannot compete with the Chinese producers, who are able to sell their products at a lower cost. It’s obvious these tariffs will harm consumers by cutting supply and increasing domestic costs. They also harm U.S. exporters, because trade is a two-way street: For the Chinese to buy American goods, they need American dollars. Fewer imports mean fewer exports. And tariffs harm everyone else by preventing productive resources from finding their highest-return, lowest-cost uses.

### US pursuing protectionist policies – Steel

#### US protectionist on steel now- tariffs on seven nations

People’s Daily Online [[Xinhua](http://www.xinhuanet.com/english2010/), Chinese news outlet]¶ June 14, 2013¶ U.S. to keep anti-dumping duties on steelconcrete reinforcing bars from seven countries¶ <http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90777/8284312.html>

The United States determined Thursday it would maintain the existing anti-dumping duty on steel concrete reinforcing bars from China, Belarus, Indonesia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland and Ukraine, despite Beijing's repeated calls for Washington to drop protectionism. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) concluded that revoking the current anti-dumping duty orders on the product from the seven countries would likely lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.

#### US crazy protectionist on steel now- anti dumping tariffs on foreign steel

The Stock Watch [online financial news and analysis website]¶ July 5th, 2013¶ Asian multinational steel anti-dumping investigation by the United States¶ <http://www.thestockmarketwatch.co/asian-multinational-steel-anti-dumping-investigation-by-the-united-states.html>

Yesterday Beijing Daily reporter was informed that includes a number of companies, including U.S. Steel mills with the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) for the Asian countries and regions imported some of the oil and gas industry with steel pipe anti-dumping investigations, involving India, South Korea, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, China Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam. Although this does not involve the Chinese mainland, but the domestic steel industry is undoubtedly the biggest victim of international trade protection.¶ Recommended Reading¶ Seven inventory Qin Baomu Industry¶ More recently exposed Qin Baomu industry in the breeding, rearing, slaughtering, processing and marketing … [Details]¶ institutions see City: Watch Daily News quotes two highlights¶ balance Po hot sun Single Cock wire lead Aspects of financial experience¶ back on the 2000 popular gathering take a good look half price¶ turn for the better performance opportunities 820,000,000 shares Kuangzhui 8 pre-hi¶ broker Latest Rating: 20 stocks dip Zengcang be bold¶ Reports Disclosure approaching seven stocks sounding “performance warning”¶ institutions Nuggets stocks exposed diaocang whereabouts Billboard¶ Reported that U.S. steel mills require from those countries to impose anti-dumping duties on steel pipes and requests for imports from India and Turkey steel imposition of countervailing duties. My steel mesh Chief Information Officer Xuxiang Chun told Beijing Business Daily reporter, recently, the European and American trade protectionism trend evident warming, many countries and regions worldwide steel imports strict control, especially directed against China. Today 3, U.S. mills also called ITC steel from China to take action, in fact, the United States has most steel products to China imposed anti-dumping duties and countervailing duties.¶ ¶ More noteworthy is that in the past three, the Federal Court ruled against “non-market economy country” illegal countervailing measures, the U.S. Congress started the legislative process quickly completed the countervailing bill changes, retained government subsidies for China and other countries to obtain goods taxing authority. U.S. trade law allows domestic steel mills to modify to get more protection, while China, the world’s largest steel-producing countries will feel the biting cold.

### US pursuing protectionist policies – Auto Manufacturing

#### Upswing in protectionist measures in auto manufacturing causes US to backlash

**Plummer 12** (Robert, Business reporter, “Protectionism: Is it on the way back?,” *BBC News*, 9/17/2012, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-18104024>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

As the global economy continues to face tough times, governments are increasingly playing politics with trade and giving in to protectionism. Says who? Well, Chinese officials, as it happens. Earlier this year, China's top promoter of foreign trade, Wan Jifei, said rising protectionism was having a negative impact. "Trade protectionism is shortsighted and narrow-minded, and it cannot fundamentally address the problems of unemployment and economic growth worldwide," said Mr Wan, who is president of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade. "Free trade is the engine of national economic growth," he added. His view was backed by President Hu Jintao, who praised the council's role in countering protectionism. Trade tussles Now, you might think it a bit rich for China to denounce such measures, given that Beijing is routinely accused by others of protectionist behaviour. Most recently, US President Barack Obama has alleged that China illegally subsidises exports of cars and car parts, thus forcing US manufacturers to shift production overseas. On the other side of the US political fence, anti-China sentiment is also strong. The Republicans' Mitt Romney has pledged to declare China a "currency manipulator" if he is elected president in November, reflecting the anger felt by many Americans over what they see as the deliberate undervaluing of the yuan to favour Chinese exporters. China is already facing several cases at the World Trade Organization (WTO), including one brought jointly by the US, the EU and Japan over its restrictions on rare earth exports. On the other hand, China also sees itself as a victim of protectionism. In an effort to alleviate the pressure, it has begun talks with Japan and South Korea on a free-trade pact. Some observers think the US should put its own house in order before it starts calling other nations protectionist. After all, one proposal on the "to-do list" that President Barack Obama presented to Congress in the spring was a 20% tax credit for firms that relocate jobs to the US from abroad. But the US can also point to fresh progress on trade liberalisation after its long-delayed free-trade deal with Colombia finally took effect in May. Even so, fresh bilateral trade disputes between the US and China keep emerging. In another row, Washington has slapped anti-dumping tariffs on Chinese solar panels, which it says are being sold at unfairly low prices. China denounced the move as protectionist, but the EU has also now begun an anti-dumping investigation into the trade.

### US pursuing protectionist policies – A2 EU Deal

#### US-EU talks halted- Snowden proves

**Wissgott, 2013**

(Sim Sim, “Outraged Morales leaves Austria”, Business Day, July 3, http://www.bdlive.co.za/world/americas/2013/07/03/outraged-morales-leaves-austria, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Mr Snowden’s latest major leak about US spying on EU countries has angered many European governments and threatened to derail preparations for delicate talks on a huge free-trade deal between Washington and Brussels. On Wednesday, Austrian Interior Minister Johanna Mikl-Leitner said Europe’s trust in the US had been "shattered" by the allegations. France meanwhile called for a temporary suspension of the trade talks. "This is not about stopping negotiations on the free trade agreement, but it does seem wise to temporarily suspend them, probably for a period of 15 days, to avoid controversy and to give time to obtain the requested information," Najat Vallaud-Belkacem said after a cabinet session. EU ambassadors are due to discuss the US spy allegations in Brussels on Thursday.

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – through WTO

#### Mexico pushes for ties with Canada- pushing through WTO- meat labeling proves

**Clark,** Foreign Affairs reporter, **2013**

(Campbell, “Mexico pushes for direct ties with Canada, apart from U.S. Influence”, The Globe and Mail, June 18, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/mexico-pushes-for-closer-direct-ties-with-canada-apart-from-us-influence/article12594783/?cmpid=rss1>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

New Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto wants ties with Canada to be a priority in the country’s foreign policy, rather than the on-again, off-again interest of two countries distracted by relations with the United States, Mexico’s ambassador says.Ambassador Francisco Suarez Davila arrived in Ottawa a week ago with a mandate to pursue a new deepening of relations between the two countries – not just for dealing with the U.S., but also as direct trading partners, and potential diplomatic allies on the world stage.“I think I have arrived at a very opportune time. The political stars are aligned,” Mr. Suarez said in an interview with The Globe and Mail. “That’s the indication I have received from President Pena, to go beyond the rhetoric to really establish that Canada is a priority for Mexico’s foreign policy. It’s a real priority: Canada, itself, apart from the North American [regional dynamic].”It is a simple but important signal in Canada-Mexico relations: that the two countries should see each other as important for more than just what that means in dealing with the United States. They have been trade partners in the North American Free Trade Agreement since 1993, and from time to time expressed a desire for stronger ties. But the interest has blown hot and cold. Both countries’ perspectives on North America are, of course, dominated by relations with the U.S. “It’s a fact of life that we have this big elephant in between. It’s there. But we don’t at all like the idea of an off and on approach,” Mr. Suarez said. “Sort of, you know, oh now Mexico is important, but until that time, no, it’s more important for us just to have a relationship with the United States.”The “political stars” that Mr. Suarez refers to is that changes in both capitals are coming at the same time as Ottawa tries to re-focus Canadian foreign policy around major emerging markets, and Mr. Pena is signalling new interest in Canada.Mr. Suarez, an economist who has served as Mexico’s envoy to the International Monetary Fund and to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, noted the two countries are already important to each other in economic terms, as each other’s third-largest trading partners.He noted that Mexico and Canada joined together to fight protectionist U.S. meat-labelling rules, known by the acronym COOL, by challenging them at the World Trade Organization, winning a decision from a trade tribunal.“We acted together with the WTO. We’ve got the decision. And we’re ready to act, taking possible reprisals if they don’t fulfill the WTO. Common vision and common action,” Mr. Suarez said. He said that Mexico and Canada can strike a similar alliance in 12-nation talks for the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to ensure that the talks stay focused on economics and trade, and that it is not used by the U.S. to jockey with China for political influence.Within North America, Canada and Mexico have common interests in integrating the continent’s three economies, by pushing for better-aligned infrastructure – notably railways and oil-and-gas pipelines – across the continent. That, and cheap energy – from the U.S. shale-gas revolution, and extensive oil and gas in both Canada and Mexico, can lead to a revival of North American manufacturing if it’s combined with integrated infrastructure and better transportation costs, he argues, leading to “the re-industrialization of these countries.”For many in the United States and Canada, however, the question is whether it is Mexico, with lower labour costs, that will benefit primarily from a revival of North American manufacturing. American auto manufacturers and Canadian companies like Bombardier have built plants in Mexico to take advantage of lower wages.But Mr. Suarez argues that’s a short-sighted argument. Mexico, with a young population, can offer a labour force to the U.S. and Canada, but also a market with a middle class of 50 million people. And Canadians can benefit when their companies manufacture in Mexico, he argues. “You developed Bombardier as a very successful enterprise in Canada,” he said. “They are building airplane parts [in Mexico]. Those airplane parts are sent to Canada, and they integrate the Bombardier full units here. But at a cost where they can where the Bombardier planes can compete better with the Brazilian planes, or whatever.”

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – general

#### No Trade barriers pursuit for Mexico- new partnership of Mercosur proves

**Jones, 2013**

(“Chile, Peru, Colombia, and Mexico to eliminate trade barriers”, The Santiago Times, January 28, <http://www.santiagotimes.cl/world/latin-america/25660-chile-peru-colombia-and-mexico-to-eliminate-trade-barriers>, accessed on 7/6/13, BT)

Chile, Peru, Colombia and Mexico agreed to completely free up trade between the four countries during the sixth annual Summit of the Pacific Alliance, held in Santiago on Sunday. The decision, made within the framework of the CELAC-EU Summit, which concludes Monday in Santiago, is the latest initiative from the new regional partnership launched to counterbalance the Atlantic-facing, Brazil-led Mercosur group.President Sebastián Piñera announced that member nations decided to "close our tariff agreement before March 31st this year, which means that at least 90 percent of products will be freed from all kinds of tax on trade between our countries.”“The remaining 10 percent will have a timetable in which to achieve the goal of 100 percent free trade," added Piñera in a joint statement with presidents Juan Manuel Santos of Colombia, Ollanta Humala of Peru and Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico. No timeline was given for this goal.

#### Mexico is very trade liberalized

Friedman 2013 (Thomas Friedman, Thomas L. Friedman won the 2002 Pulitzer Prize, 2-23-13, “How Mexico Got Back in the Game,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/24/opinion/sunday/friedman-how-mexico-got-back-in-the-game.html?_r=0>)

Something happened here. It’s as if Mexicans subconsciously decided that their drug-related violence is a condition to be lived with and combated but not something to define them any longer. Mexico has signed 44 free trade agreements — more than any country in the world — which, according to The Financial Times, is more than twice as many as China and four times more than Brazil. Mexico has also greatly increased the number of engineers and skilled laborers graduating from its schools. Put all that together with massive cheap natural gas finds, and rising wage and transportation costs in China, and it is no surprise that Mexico now is taking manufacturing market share back from Asia and attracting more global investment than ever in autos, aerospace and household goods. “Today, Mexico exports more manufactured products than the rest of Latin America put together,” The Financial Times reported on Sept. 19, 2012. “Chrysler, for example, is using Mexico as a base to supply some of its Fiat 500s to the Chinese market.” What struck me most here in Monterrey, though, is the number of tech start-ups that are emerging from Mexico’s young population — 50 percent of the country is under 29 — thanks to cheap, open source innovation tools and cloud computing.

### Mexico pursuing protectionist policies – general

#### Protectionist trend on the rise – Mexico included

The Bangkok Post 7-3-13 (Neglect Triggers Global Trust Deficit – LN)

For example, after spending decades encouraging developing countries to integrate their economies into the global market, advanced countries now balk at trade openness. Indeed, despite pledges not to erect trade barriers after the global economic crisis, more than 800 new protectionist measures were introduced from late 2008 through 2010. G8 countries, the supposed champions of the global free-trade agenda that dominates the World Trade Organisation, accounted for the lion's share of these measures. Some question the leadership ability of Brics. But many emerging markets are already leading by example on important issues like the need to shift global financial flows from debt toward equity. Mexico, for example, recently adopted \_ ahead of schedule \_ the changes in capital requirements for banks recommended by the Third Basel Accord (Basel III), in order to reduce leverage and increase stability. For too long, developed countries have clung to their outsize influence in the international financial institutions, even as their fiscal fitness has dwindled. By ignoring the advice that they so vehemently dispensed to the developing world, they brought the world economy to its knees. Now, they refuse to fulfil their promises of global cooperation.

### Mexico pursuing protectionist policies – Agriculture

#### Mexico has trade barriers raised on agriculture imports now- seen as important to protect key sector

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. ¶ Mexico’s Agriculture Development: Perspectives and Outlook¶ June 26, 2013¶ <http://unctad.org/en/pages/newsdetails.aspx?OriginalVersionID=554>

The study was presented by Mr. Guillermo Valles, Director of UNCTAD's Division on International Trade in Goods and Services, and Commodities, and was commented upon by Mr. Ulises Canchola, Deputy Permanent Representative of Mexico; Mr. Luis Enrique Chávez Basagoitia, Permanent Representative of Peru; and Mr. Minelik Alemu Getahun, Permanent Representative of Ethiopia.¶ The Ambassadors commended UNCTAD on the professionalism and high level of technicality of the study. It was stated that the study achieved its objective, and helped overcome the perception that might exist of rural areas and agriculture being a problem, rather than an opportunity for development. The collaboration between UNCTAD and a range of different contributors in Mexico, including from the Government, the private sector and academia, had been a vital factor in the success of the study.¶ The importance of agriculture as a fundamental pillar for development and poverty alleviation in rural areas was stressed, as was the importance of financing for farmers and the implementation of the competition policy regime. The use of agriculture to produce renewable energy was also emphasized as being catalytic to agricultural production. The link between agriculture and the environment was emphasized in terms of agricultural production that protects the environment, such as organic agriculture and biotrade.¶ The need for agreements to open up trade in agriculture under fair rules for all, including in the WTO Doha Round, as well as the need to reduce barriers - particularly non-tariff measures - in agricultural trade and food security, was highlighted. The importance of assessing the impact of regional trade agreements on agricultural development was stressed, too.

### Mexico pursuing protectionist policies – Energy

#### Mexico protectionist on oil now- don’t respect free trade agreements

Yuma Sun News [news outlet]¶ Trust an issue in Mexico oil situation¶ June 24, 2013¶ <http://www.yumasun.com/articles/mexico-88325-companies-oil.html>

Mexico is about to open its oil industry to private investors. New money will no doubt jump in to buy up Mexican oil stocks and lease agreements in Mexico. Old money will be reluctant to risk money in Mexico after once seeing their holdings nationalized in 1938. Trade agreements don't mean much in Mexico. Many U.S. companies who jumped into Mexico after the North American free trade agreement was signed in the early 1980s were chasing cheap labor. For a while everything went well and the companies across the United States started to move in to Mexico for production. Most of the American companies knew that they were going to have to put up with mordida as it was a way of life in Mexico. When the cost of mordida became too high for some of these companies, they tried to move production machinery to other countries or back to the United States, but were stopped at the border and were confiscated by Mexican bureaucrats, millions of dollars worth of machinery were lost. Many of these companies ended up moving to Asia. Some of those companies that were in Mexico are right here in Yuma today. The rule of law in Mexico is almost nonexistent today. Until things change in Mexican courts, the oil and minerals that are so plentiful will stay there because investors will not risk their money to help Mexico retrieve the bounty of natural resources. The big problem is not whether other countries trust Mexico, the largest problem is most Mexicans don't trust Mexicans.

#### Mexico protecting its oil sector now- mass competition from China

The Asihi Shimbun [online news outlet and organization]¶ Mexico sets anti-dumping duties on China seamless steel pipes¶ June 21, 2013¶ <http://ajw.asahi.com/article/economy/business/AJ201306210101>

Mexico has set duties on seamless steel tubes from China, the Asian giant's commerce ministry said on June 21, after a Mexican steel company complained about unfair pricing practices.¶ The decision, effective from June 21, is a victory for TAMSA, the Mexican arm of steel company Tenaris, which had complained last year about price differences between Chinese-made seamless steel pipes and Mexican ones.¶ The tariff is set at $1,252 per ton and will not exceed 56 percent of the customs duty price after tax, the commerce ministry said in a statement.¶ In 2010, Mexico imposed anti-dumping tariffs on Chinese seamless steel tubes, often used for oil and gas pipelines. At the time, the economy ministry said the tubes were entering the country at below-market prices, hurting the national industry.¶ China, the world's biggest producer and consumer of steel, has been repeatedly cited by its major trade partners, such as the United States and the European Union, for alleged dumping in its massive exports of steel products.¶ TAMSA had filed its probe request in late September, citing "considerable volumes of imports of seamless steel pipes from China which entered the domestic market under discriminatory price terms," Mexico's economy ministry said in the Official Gazette.¶ Last October, Mexico accused China of breaking World Trade Organization rules by providing tax breaks and other favorable deals to its own clothing and textile businesses.¶ Mexico's government has voiced worry about its massive trade deficit with China, largely caused by an influx of manufactured goods. More than 15 percent of Mexico's imports came from China last year, worth roughly $57 billion, while just 1.5 percent, or $5.7 billion, of Mexican exports went to the Asian giant.¶ Mexico and China have been direct competitors to supply the U.S. market with manufactured goods and Mexican producers have fought to keep the Chinese off their turf.

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with the US

#### Mexico in Negotiations with US over trade partnerships- TTP proves

**Petras, 2013**

(Professor James, “Washington’s “Dual Imperial Strategy” in Latin America: Breakdown of the Columbia-Venezuela – FARC Peace Process”, Global Research, June 7, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/washingtons-dual-imperial-strategy-in-latin-america-breakdown-of-the-colombia-venezuela-farc-peace-process/5338107>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Washington has devised a dual strategy toward Latin America .  This involves a new set of ambitious imperial initiatives designed to undermine the principal anti-imperialist governments ( Venezuela ), social movements and armed insurgency (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia), while dismantling Latin America-centered integration and regional alliances, such as ALBA, Petro-Caribe, UNASUR and MERCOSUR.  At the same time the US seeks to establish an alternative US-centered  ‘integration scheme’ through the Latin America and Asia-the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which encourages closer ties among neo-liberal states, like Mexico, Colombia, Peru and Chile with their energy and mining sector-dependent development strategies.

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Venezuela

#### Mexico and Venezuela major trading partners- linked by bilateral trade agreements now

Monica Hirst [Brazilian-U.S. expert in international affairs based ¶ in Buenos Aires. She is a professor in the Department of Economics ¶ and Administration at Quilmes National University and teaches in ¶ the master’s programme in international relations at Torcuato Di ¶ Tella University]¶ Cuban-Latin American and Caribbean ¶ relations: challenges beyond ¶ normalization¶ June 2013¶ <http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/4ddd027eb8853fc6b6464705b630c332.pdf>

Primarily based on personal friendship and deep ideological affinities, the Castro-Chávez connection was central to ¶ legitimising the Bolivarian socialist project, promoting the ¶ ALBA group (2004), and unblocking communications ¶ between leftist guerrilla groups and the government in ¶ Colombia. Cuban military advisers in Venezuela became ¶ crucial for local intelligence activities and involved direct ¶ participation in presidential logistics, weapons training and ¶ shared anti-U.S. strategic planning.6¶ In 2011 trade with ¶ Venezuela represented 38% of total Cuban exchanges, ¶ while in Latin America the partnership with Venezuela ¶ represented 81% of Cuba’s trade with the region. The ¶ bilateral accord introduced in 2003 set preferential pricing ¶ for the export of Cuban professional services (mainly ¶ medical) in exchange for the provision of oil and joint ¶ investments in strategic areas, plus the provision of ¶ generous credit lines.7

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Brazil

#### Mexico and Brazil engaged in bilateral trade agreements now

JULIE ZEPEDA¶ [Writing for-- National Latino Cosmotology Association (NLCA) NLCA’s mission is to support the beauty industry by providing educational and career development resources to the beauty professional and student]¶ [Brazil, Mexico Sign Bilateral Agreement](http://nlcamerican.blogspot.com/2013/06/brazil-mexico-sign-bilateral-agreement.html)¶ JUNE 16, 2013¶ <http://nlcamerican.blogspot.com/2013/06/brazil-mexico-sign-bilateral-agreement.html>

Representatives of the Brazilian and Mexican cosmetic industries have signed a bilateral trade agreement, which seeks to eliminate duties between the two countries for 31 categories of products—including fragrances, makeup, shampoos and deodorants. The agreement aims to strengthen both the Brazilian and Mexican cosmetics industry and contribute to job creation. The agreement, signed by João Carlos Basilio (ABIHPEC) and Carlos R. Berzunza Sánchez (CANIPEC), updates the 2002 economic agreement between the two countries.

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Ecuador

#### Ecuador and mexico have trade relations

**Ecuador Explorer, 2013**

(“Ecuador Foreign Trade”, Ecuador Explorer, July 9, <http://www.ecuadorexplorer.com/html/trade.html>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

The export of primary goods and the import of capital and manufactured products have historically characterized Ecuador’s trade. While petroleum remains Ecuador’s most important export and economic force, an increasing diversity in export products (most notably the recent dramatic rise in the export of cut flowers; in just a few years Ecuador has become the leading supplier of cut flowers to the United States) is reducing the historical volatility of Ecuador’s export revenues and is helping to stabilize its economy.The United States, European Union countries, Columbia, Chile, and Japan are Ecuador’s primary trading partners. In 1998, the United States exported USD 1.6 billion worth of goods to Ecuador, or about 30% of Ecuador’s total imports, and received nearly 40% of Ecuador’s exports, making it the country’s leading import and export partner. Colombia, Japan, Mexico, Venezuela, Spain, Germany, Brazil, and Chile together supplied approximately a 40% share of the Ecuadorian import market and likewise, were the destinations of almost 40% of Ecuador’s exports.Ecuador’s active membership in global trade organizations and its participation in a number of regional free trade zones confirm the nation’s trend toward liberalization and its commitment to open trade. Ecuador is a member of the World Trade Organization (“WTO”), the Andean Community, and the Latin American Integration Association (“ALADI”). In addition, Ecuador has concluded bilateral free trade agreements with Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela, is negotiating a trade agreement with Mexico, is engaged in trade talks with the Mercosur nations of Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, and Uruguay, and fully supports the establishment of a free trade area for the Americas.Ecuador’s application of free market principals, including the lowering of trade barriers, its participation in numerous international trade organizations, and a firm commitment to diversification of its economy and reform of its financial institutions, are helping to restore a favorable balance of trade and generally better the nation’s economy.

#### Ecuador looking to trade with Mexico and South/Latin American countries

**Padilla, 2013**

(Luis, “Market diversification reflected in the trade agreements signed by Ecuador since 2008”, Andes, <http://www.andes.info.ec/en/actualidad-economia/market-diversification-reflected-trade-agreements-signed-ecuador-2008.html>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

A possible reopening for negotiations of a trade agreement with the European Union sparks hope in the exportation sector in Ecuador; nevertheless, the South American country currently has 26 trade agreements with countries in South America and in other regions.These negotiations have been led since 2008 by the Delegation for Foreign Trade of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which will soon become a ministry and leave the platform of Foreign Affairs, the branch under which it is currently stands.The country is in eight negotiations with countries from South America. With Argentina, Mexico and Nicaragua, Ecuador is close to reaching an agreement on 100 percent duty-free taxes.With Paraguay, El Salvador, Venezuela, and countries from the Caribbean and Mercosur, Ecuador is in ongoing conversations on partial duty-free taxes, permanent entry and regulatory protocol.Outside the region, Ecuador has signed memorandums of understanding and mutual economic cooperation, and holds consultation processes and tax negotiations.In the last case, agreements with Algeria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iran, Iraq and Syria.With the objective of expanding the reach of the memorandums are: Turkey, Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates.In addition to these developing negations, the country has demonstrated interest in starting negotiations with the Dominican Republic, Pacific Alliance, Switzerland, Canada, Russia, China and Korea.To date, the country has signed 13 foreign trade agreements with the following countries: Chile 97% tariff liberalization, Brazil (tariff free), Cuba (284 products without tariffs), Panama (tariff free for Ecuadorian products), Venezuela (maintains Andean Community of Nations preferences) and Guatemala (700 products without taxes and 222 subheadings of MIPYMES).Additionally, commercial agreements have been signed with Turkey, Iran, Belarus, Indonesia, India, Qatar and Lebanon.

#### Ecuador emerging as trade leader in the region – includes Mexico

**Stratfor Global Intelligence, 2013**

(“Ecuador emerges as Latin America’s leftist leader”, The Philippine Star, July 2, <http://www.philstar.com/letters-editor/2013/07/02/960600/ecuador-emerges-latin-americas-leftist-leader>, accessed on7/9/13, BT)

Ecuador’s withdrawal from a US trade agreement exemplifies Ecuador’s emergence as a leader in Latin America, which is divided in its relations with the United States. On Thursday, Ecuador unilaterally left the Andean Trade Preference and Drug Eradication Act, a preferential trade agreement with the United States. Quito meant to pre-empt what was likely to be a showdown with the U.S. Congress over the agreement’s renewal. Though tensions between the two countries had been growing for months, animosities peaked recently when Washington threatened to cancel the agreement over the possibility that Ecuador may offer asylum for former Booz Allen Hamilton employee Edward Snowden.Ending the agreement is a superficial, albeit highly symbolic, gesture that reveals much about Ecuador’s geopolitical position in Latin America. Latin America is loosely grouped into two economic blocs and political ideologies. One such bloc, the Pacific Alliance, brings Peru, Chile, Mexico and Colombia together under a free trade regime. The Common Market of the South, also known as Mercosur, brings together Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay and Venezuela. In his efforts to lead Ecuador away from a pro-U.S. policy, President Rafael Correa has aligned more closely with the latter bloc. Correa seeks Mercosur membership as a long-term alternative to trade with the United States, which has traditionally dominated Ecuador’s trade and its politics.What is a Geopolitical Diary? George Friedman explains.As he disengages the United States, Correa is emerging as the region’s most powerful leftist leader. Many current Latin American political leaders, some of whom criticize U.S. foreign policy, face domestic political challenges. Venezuela remains divided after Nicolas Maduro’s hotly contested presidential election in April. Argentine President Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner faces a decline in support among the middle class — the very group that brought her husband Nestor Kirchner to power in 2003. In such a political environment, Correa appears to be the informal leader of the Latin American political left.Correa’s international prominence stems from his ability to effectively consolidate political control of a fractious state after his election in 2007. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, Ecuador’s economy collapsed, and the ensuing political instability led to the failures of several governments and to two coups. Correa has provided the political stability the country lacked for a decade prior to his rule. Along with increased social spending, this stability gave Correa substantial political support that other leftist leaders do not have. Moreover, Ecuador’s considerable revenue from oil exports — particularly to the United States — enabled the government to act without concern for opposition groups.Correa’s popularity allowed Ecuador to act more aggressively in the international arena. Correa was able to unilaterally withdraw from ATPDEA because the decision affected few constituents loyal to him. The business community that opposed the move is not among Correa’s supporters, so he had little to lose in the move. Similarly, the Ecuadorian government has sought membership in Mercosur and has reached out to China and Iran for economic and political ties despite opposition from domestic groups and the United States.Despite Correa’s actions, the decision to cancel ATPDEA does not fundamentally change Ecuador’s current economic relationship with the United States. U.S Congressional opposition against the preferential trade agreement would probably have halted its renewal anyway (it was set to expire July 31). Ecuador’s considerable trade links to the United States will continue for the foreseeable future because USs refineries on the West Coast are a natural market for Ecuadorian oil. Ecuador thus will continue its somewhat paradoxical foreign policy of opposing the United States rhetorically while depending on its energy market economically.

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Russia

#### Mexico-Russia bilateral ties increasing- influx of tourism and trade

**ITAR-TASS 2013**

(Information Telegraph Agency of Russia- Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union Newswire, “Mexico to develop trade ties with Russia,” 1-12-13, LexisNexis, 7-8-13, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)//KC

A seminar is being held at the Foreign Ministry of Mexico to reveal new possibilities for the development of trade and economic ties between Mexico and Russia. As the organizers of the seminar told ITAR-TASS on Friday, it the seminar is headed by recently appointed ambassador of Mexico to Russia Ruben Beltran. Representatives of Mexican enterprises, who are interested in establishing contacts with Russian partners, take part in the forum. They pointed to great possibilities for expanding commercial ties with Russia. According to the seminar participants, over the lasts three years, the volume of trade and economic ties between Mexico and Russia has considerably grown in such spheres as tourism, trade and investments. In the period from 2010 to 2011, the volume of bilateral economic ties increased by 219 percent. It is noteworthy that in the first half of 2012 alone, tourists' inflow from Russia to this Latina American country reached a record-high figure of 45,000 people. Russia ranks third now among importers of meet produced in Mexico. The seminar participants, who represented the private sector of economy of Mexico, pointed to a great potential in the development of bilateral ties in such spheres as energy, motor-car industry and food supply, as well as a number of other spheres. According to them, a rather productive exchange of experience was established between the two countries for expanding bilateral trade. The seminar is held in accordance with the instructions of Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto who noted in one of his statements that apart from the United States, his country's foreign policy should be oriented at the expansion of foreign trade with other countries. The share of the United States in Mexico's trade and economic ties amounts to more than 80 percent.

#### Mexico/ Russia bilateral trade agreements on the rise now

Americas Quarterly [The Policy Journal for Our Hemisphere is the only magazine dedicated to policy analysis and debate of economics, finance, social development, and politics in the Western Hemisphere]¶ [New Push for Stronger Russia-Mexico Ties](http://www.americasquarterly.org/new-push-stronger-russia-mexico-ties)¶ MAY 17, 2013¶ by [AQ Online](http://www.americasquarterly.org/blogger/578)¶ <http://www.americasquarterly.org/blogger/578>

[Mexican Secretary of Foreign](http://es-us.noticias.yahoo.com/m%C3%A9xico-rusia-comprometidos-reforzar-lazos-alto-nivel-190922041.html" \t "_blank) Affairs José Antonio Meade met with Russian Senator Valentina I. Matvienko president of the Federation Council of the General Assembly in Mexico City, to celebrate a cooperation agreement signed earlier in the week that highlights the importance of stronger relations between the two countries.¶ [During a ceremony earlier this week](http://noticierostelevisa.esmas.com/nacional/596547/mexico-y-rusia-se-unen-combate-corrupcion/" \t "_blank) Ernesto Cordero, president of Mexico’s Permanent Commission of Congress (Comisión permanente del Congreso de la Unión)[said that both countries are being called upon to play a](http://imagenpoblana.com/2012/mexico-y-rusia-firman-convenio-interparlamentario" \t "_blank) leading role in the global economy for their notable industrial development and natural resources. Lawmakers stressed that bilateral trade between Mexico and Russia has continued to grow—reaching $5 billion last year—as has tourism with over 80,000 Russians visiting Mexico in 2012. ¶ Bilateral discussions between Russian President Vladimir Putin and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto will continue in the coming months when they meet at the summit of leaders of the Group of Twenty (G20), to be held in Saint Petersburg, Russia, on September 5 and 6, 2013, and at the [XXII Annual Asia Pacific Parliamentary](http://www.appf.org.pe/" \t "_blank) Forum (APPF) from January 12 to January 16, 2014, held in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico.

#### Mexico-Russia high and projected to increase

**AQ Online 2013**

(Americas Quarterly Online, “New Push for Stronger Russia-Mexico Ties,” 5-17-13, 7-8-13, http://www.americasquarterly.org/new-push-stronger-russia-mexico-ties)//KC

Mexican Secretary of Foreign Affairs José Antonio Meade met with Russian Senator Valentina I. Matvienko president of the Federation Council of the General Assembly in Mexico City, to celebrate a cooperation agreement signed earlier in the week that highlights the importance of stronger relations between the two countries. During a ceremony earlier this week Ernesto Cordero, president of Mexico’s Permanent Commission of Congress (Comisión permanente del Congreso de la Unión) said that both countries are being called upon to play a leading role in the global economy for their notable industrial development and natural resources. Lawmakers stressed that bilateral trade between Mexico and Russia has continued to grow—reaching $5 billion last year—as has tourism with over 80,000 Russians visiting Mexico in 2012. Comment on this post Bilateral discussions between Russian President Vladimir Putin and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto will continue in the coming months when they meet at the summit of leaders of the Group of Twenty (G20), to be held in Saint Petersburg, Russia, on September 5 and 6, 2013, and at the XXII Annual Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF) from January 12 to January 16, 2014, held in Puerto Vallarta, Mexico. In addition, earlier this week, Mexican Deputy Secretary of Foreign Affairs Carlos de Icaza and Russian Vice Minister of External Relations Serguey A. Riabkov committed to solidifying new strategies to strengthen bilateral agreements on maritime transportation, nuclear energy and extradition measures. They also addressed the Russian government's decision to suspend the import of meat products from Mexico as well as the anti-dumping measures placed on Russian steel imports by the Mexican government. De Icaza announced that passengers can now purchase direct flights between the Mexican and Russian capitals. Riabkov signaled his government’s willingness to sign the Suppression of Visas Agreement in Ordinary Passports (Acuerdo de Supresion de Visas en Pasaportes Ordinarios) — an agreement that is being considered in Mexico to abolish travel visas for tourists visiting both countries.

### Mexico pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with China

#### Latin America partnering with China

**Ben-Ami, 2013**

(Shlomo, “Is US losing Latin America”, Times of Oman, June 18, <http://www.timesofoman.com/Columns/Article-1173.aspx>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Indeed, at the Summit of the Americas in Cartagena in April 2012, Latin American leaders felt sufficiently confident and united to challenge US priorities in the region. They urged the US to lift its embargo on Cuba, claiming that it had damaged relations with the rest of the continent, and to do more to combat drug use on its own turf, through education and social work, rather than supplying arms to fight the drug lords in Latin America – a battle that all acknowledged has been an utter failure.It is also true that Latin American countries have pursued a massive expansion of economic ties beyond America's sway. China is now Latin America's second-largest trading partner and rapidly closing the gap with the US. India is showing keen interest in the region's energy industry, and has signed export agreements in the defence sector. Iran has strengthened its economic and military ties, especially in Venezuela.

### Cuba pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Venezuela

#### Venezuela-Cuba verify excellent state of bilateral relations

**BBC Worldwide Monitoring 2013**

(“Cuban leader, Venezuelan speaker discuss ties,” 6-11-13, LexisNexis, 7-8-13, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)//KC

The two leaders verified the excellent state of bilateral relations and held a fruitful exchange on topics on the regional and international agendas. The Army General ratified Cuba's invariable support for the Bolivarian Revolution, and highlighted its contribution to Latin American and Caribbean integration. Raul praised the efforts of the Venezuelan government, under the leadership of President Nicolas Maduro, to guarantee the continuity of the work of late President Hugo Chavez and preserve the irreversible achievements of the people of that fraternal nation. Participating in the meeting was Foreign Minister Bruno Rodriguez.

#### Cuba-Venezuela economic ties high and set to continue

**BBC Worldwide Monitoring 2013**

(“Cuban, Venezuelan presidents praise friendship, cooperation,” 5-2-13, LexisNexis, 7-8-13, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)//KC

"It is the path of unity, duty and true integration of Latin American and Caribbean peoples", said the Venezuelan President in the last-night speech during the closure of the meeting, which was followed by Cuban President Raul Castro's speech. Maduro said that both sides agreed an important amount of joint investment, 2 billion USD, for economic and industrial development, culture, health, education and food production, besides the creation of joint companies to take on the development of vital and strategic areas of those countries' economy. The Venezuelan President highlighted as a result of mutual cooperation the creation of 6,712 medical posts for the people and 571 integral centres of health, 583 integral rehabilitation centres and 35 high-technology centres. Due to the bilateral cooperation, 40, 000 Cuban doctors have served in Venezuela and 1,756,261 Venezuelans learnt to read and write. In his speech, President Raul Castro pointed out that Chavez was, as Fidel said, Cuba's best friend. He was an inspiring and restless fighter for the consolidation of the Bolivarian Alliance of the Peoples for our America (ALBA), he said. Cuban President also said that a remarkable result of the meeting has been the sign of the Memorandum of Agreement which settles an economic agenda for medium and long terms. Ministers of both countries signed 3 agreements on culture, health and education, besides the Memorandum of Agreement and the Final Proceedings of the 13th meeting. The last two documents were signed by the co-presidents of that work group, the vice president of the Council of Ministers for Territorial Development and the Venezuelan minister for Petroleum and Mining, Rafael Ramirez, and the Cuban minister for Foreign Trade and Foreign Investments, Rodrigo Malmierca.

#### Mexico and Venezuela major trading partners- linked by bilateral trade agreements now

Monica Hirst [Brazilian-U.S. expert in international affairs based ¶ in Buenos Aires. She is a professor in the Department of Economics ¶ and Administration at Quilmes National University and teaches in ¶ the master’s programme in international relations at Torcuato Di ¶ Tella University]¶ Cuban-Latin American and Caribbean ¶ relations: challenges beyond ¶ normalization¶ June 2013¶ <http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/4ddd027eb8853fc6b6464705b630c332.pdf>

Primarily based on personal friendship and deep ideological affinities, the Castro-Chávez connection was central to ¶ legitimising the Bolivarian socialist project, promoting the ¶ ALBA group (2004), and unblocking communications ¶ between leftist guerrilla groups and the government in ¶ Colombia. Cuban military advisers in Venezuela became ¶ crucial for local intelligence activities and involved direct ¶ participation in presidential logistics, weapons training and ¶ shared anti-U.S. strategic planning.6¶ In 2011 trade with ¶ Venezuela represented 38% of total Cuban exchanges, ¶ while in Latin America the partnership with Venezuela ¶ represented 81% of Cuba’s trade with the region. The ¶ bilateral accord introduced in 2003 set preferential pricing ¶ for the export of Cuban professional services (mainly ¶ medical) in exchange for the provision of oil and joint ¶ investments in strategic areas, plus the provision of ¶ generous credit lines.7

#### Cuba-Venezuela bilateral ties increasing- new Raul-Maduro regime

**Arabia-2000 2013**

(“Cuba, Venezuela Sign Deals Worth Two Billion Dollars,” Qatar News Agency, 4-29-13, EBSCOhost, 7-8-13, http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=8&sid=167b1d92-6bc3-4254-871b-ef2ab0d5f9f2%40sessionmgr104&hid=105&bdata=JnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#db=nfh&AN=6FI2856687700)//KC

Havana, April 29 (QNA) - Cuba and Venezuela have signed here accords for 51 joint projects worth two billion US dollars. At the close of 13th Cuba-Venezuela Intergovernmental Meeting, Cuban President Raul Castro and Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro announced the deals for projects in such areas as education, health, sports, culture, food production, construction, transport, communications, energy and support of social missions. Havana and Caracas agreed to jointly invest two billion dollars to develop these projects and also signed a memorandum to establish a bilateral medium- and long-term economic agenda. The investment also covers joint ventures in vital and strategic economic areas in both countries. Venezuela and Cuba became close political and economic allies after Chavez took office in 1999. Venezuela sends around 130,000 barrels of oil to Cuba each day, while Havana provides professional personnel needed by Venezuela's social programs. (QNA)

### Cuba pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Brazil

#### Cuba increasing trade ties with Brazil

[Julia E. Sweig](http://www.cfr.org/experts/latin-america-brazil-cuba/julia-e-sweig/b4230), Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies June 19, 2013¶ Developments in Cuba¶ <http://www.cfr.org/cuba/developments-cuba/p30961>

In 2010 I participated in a conversation with Fidel Castro, when, in reply to a question about whether Cuba was still 'exporting' its 'model' to Latin America, he inadvertently caused an international media firestorm by replying—"the Cuban model doesn't even work for us anymore." A statement of the obvious for most Cubans, and an affirmation that real change was afoot.¶ Here are some still undigested takeaways from conversations with dozens of Cubans in and out of government about how they see that change.¶ 1-) The death of Hugo Chavez and uncertainty in Venezuela reinforces a pre-existing rationale and time frame for Cuba to deepen trade, investment, and diplomatic ties with a variety of partners. Brazil is a prime example. Add the rest of Latin America, China, Russia, Angola, the EU and eventually the United States to that strategy.

#### Cuba and Brazil bilateral trade agreements now

Trademark South Africa [Independent organization--purpose of the TradeMark Southern Africa (TMSA) programme is to improve trade performance and competitiveness of the Eastern and Southern Africa regions – contributing to sustainable, rapid and inclusive growth and poverty reduction]¶ June 25, 2013¶ Brazil: trade policy review¶ <http://www.trademarksa.org/news/brazil-trade-policy-review>

10. One of Brazil's policy aims is to strengthen regional economic integration. Brazil is a founding member of the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), and as such it has subscribed to preferential trade agreements with the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. Together with its MERCOSUR partners, Brazil also has preferential trade agreements currently in force with India and Israel, and three further agreements pending entry into force. Additionally, it has bilateral preferential agreements under LAIA with Guyana and Suriname. The European Union and MERCOSUR have re-launched negotiations in order to create a Bi-regional Free Trade Agreement.

#### Brazil-Cuba economic ties increasing- medical diplomacy

**The Editors 2013**

(“Cuba Sends Doctors to Brazil as Bilateral Ties Grow,” World Politics Review, 5-16-13, EBSCOhost, 7-8-13, http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=167b1d92-6bc3-4254-871b-ef2ab0d5f9f2%40sessionmgr104&vid=6&hid=104&bdata=JnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#db=wpr&AN=87706406)//KC

This month, the Brazilian government announced plans to employ some 6,000 Cuban doctors as part of an effort to strengthen Brazil-Cuba bilateral ties. In an email interview, John M. Kirk, a professor at Canada's Dalhousie University who co-wrote a book on Cuban medical internationalism and is finishing a second on Cuban medical cooperation, explained the history of Cuba's medical diplomacy and its importance to Cuba's slowly reforming economy. WPR: What is the extent of Cuba's medical diplomacy in terms of numbers of doctors sent abroad and the benefits Cuba receives in return? John M. Kirk: Cuba has been sending medical personnel abroad since 1960. At present there are some 39,000 Cuban medical personnel-including 15,000 doctors, approximately 20 percent of Cuba's physicians-serving abroad in 68 countries. In Venezuela alone there are 32,000 Cuban medical personnel, 11,000 of them physicians. The export of professional, mainly medical, services is Cuba's largest single source of hard currency, accounting for some $6 billion in 2012. Cuba has one doctor for every 170 patients, compared to one doctor per 390 patients in the United States, and continues to graduate large numbers of doctors. There is thus a surplus of trained medical personnel in Cuba, and this will continue to be a primary source of income. In addition, because many of the medical services are provided free or at greatly reduced rates to developing nations, Cuba receives major diplomatic support, generating "soft power." Finally, Cuban doctors receive significantly greater salaries for working abroad, which helps to compensate for the inverted social pyramid in Cuba, where their pay is poor. WPR: What is the significance of the plan to send doctors to Brazil? Kirk: This strengthens bilateral ties, as well as the growing unity in Latin America. Brazil is Cuba's second-largest trading partner in the region, and has invested $680 million in the construction of the Mariel port west of Havana, as well as giving credits of $176 million for modernizing five Cuban airports, which is needed, as tourism in Cuba reaches 3 million foreign visitors this year. In terms of trade between Cuba and Brazil, which has increased sevenfold in the past decade, the plan will help to reduce the imbalance: $560 million of the $662 million in bilateral trade in 2012 were Brazilian exports. Some 300 Brazilian companies are exporting to Cuba; the construction company Odebrecht is involved in a number of projects; and government ministers from both countries have made protocol visits. The relationship will continue to strengthen, with Cuba recognizing Brazil's rapidly growing economy, and Brazil recognizing Cuba's enormous political influence in the region.

### Cuba pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Ecuador

#### Cuba-Ecuador resume bilateral ties- meetings every 3 months

**AVN 2013**

(Agencia Venezolana de Noticias, “Ecuador, Venezuela to resume bi-national encounters,” 6-3-13, 7-8-13, http://www.avn.info.ve/contenido/ecuador-venezuela-resume-bi-national-encounters)//KC

Caracas, 03 Jun. AVN.- With a view to bolster complementarity and bilateral relations, Venezuela and Ecuador decided to resume bi-national encounters once every three months, informed Monday Foreign minister Elias Jaua. "This meeting paves the way for the next bi-national encounter between Ecuador and Venezuela, which we have to resume again every three months, as commander president Hugo Chavez and our brother president Rafael Correa used to do. Now, we will also do it under the presidency of comrade Nicolas Maduro," said Jaua in a meeting with Ecuadorean foreign minister Ricardo Patiño, in Caracas. The Venezuelan foreign minister stressed that the two countries have achieved a "close and deep relationship" as legacy of revolutionary leader Hugo Chavez and they have been reaffirmed by president Nicolas Maduro. "It is a unity also based on complementarity, solidarity, people's rights and which, of course, has a commercial element," Jaua said. In addition, the Venezuelan diplomat recalled that this country recently also gave a boost its bilateral relationship with other Latin American sister nations, such as Nicaragua. Furthermore, minister Jaua said that the Organization of American States' next general assembly in Guatemala, on June 4 or 6, will serve to carry out a meeting of the Bolivarian Alliance for the People of our America (ALBA) political council. Such meeting would be preliminary to the ALBA Summit of Presidents that will be carried out in Guayaquil, Ecuador, next July 12.

### Cuba pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Russia

#### Relations boosting trade between Cuba and Russia

**Havana Times, 2013**

(“Russia PM in Cuba to Boost Trade Ties”, Havana Times, February 21, <http://www.havanatimes.org/?p=88159>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev arrived today in Cuba in a working visit focused on boosting trade and strengthening economic ties between the two countries, according to the Russian government.Medvedev — who traveled from Brazil, the first stop on his current trip to Latin America — will meet in Havana with President Raul Castro, reported DPA news.The two leaders are expected to sign a series of agreements today, according to Cuba’s Foreign Ministry. Sources among the Russian delegation quoted by the Itar-Tass news agency spoke of the signing of seven documents.These include an agreement for cooperation in space research, a memorandum for nuclear cooperation in the medical field, and an agreement for hydro-meteorological and environmental control cooperation between the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources and Cuba’s Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, according to Itar-Tass.Russian trade with Cuba declined by 0.3 percent in 2012, according to figures released Wednesday by Moscow’s Ministry of Economic Development. The trade volume in the first 11 months of 2012 was close to $195 million.Russian exports to Cuba included mainly machinery and vehicles, which accounted for 70.3 percent of its sales to the Caribbean island. Cuba exports mainly agricultural products (97.9 percent of its sales), according to figures from the Russian government.Both countries are also seeking to undertake joint projects in the areas of energy, pharmaceuticals and industry, according to the Russian news agency.The Soviet Union, until its demise, was the main trading partner of the Cuba of Fidel Castro. The fall of the Soviet bloc pushed the island to the brink of economic collapse during the “Special Period” of the ‘90s.Since the end of that decade, Hugo Chavez’s Venezuela has become Cuba’s principal trading partner.

#### Russia and Cuba trade growing – diversifying

**Novosti, 2013**

(Ria, “Russia, Cuba Set to Diversify Trade- Lavrov”, Ria Novosti, May 30, <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20130530/181427044.html>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Russia and Cuba are planning to diversify bilateral trade, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said Thursday after talks with his Cuban counterpart, Bruno Rodriguez.“Our priority tasks are to increase and diversify trade turnover and carry out projects in spheres like energy, transport and infrastructure,” the Russian foreign minister said.Rodriguez said the two states had “promising perspectives” for cooperation in energy and civil aviation and tourism.Bilateral trade stood at $219.5 million in 2012, Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Lukashevich said ahead of the talks. Last year, a record number of 87,000 Russian tourists visited Cuba.During Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev’s visit to Cuba in February, a preliminary agreement was reached to write off part of the country’s $30 billion Soviet-era debt.Russia also agreed to lease three An-158 regional jets to its longtime ally. Talks are underway for the purchase of Ilyushin-96-400 long-haul passenger planes and Tu-204SM mid-range aircraft.

#### New trade agreements between Russia and Cuba create a new era for cooperation

**Havana, 2013**

(“Cuba and Russia extend cooperative links”, February 28, <http://www.granma.cu/ingles/cuba-i/28feb-Cuba-Russia.html>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

IN the framework of the visit to Cuba of Prime Minister Dmitry A. Medvedev and as a reflection of the two governments’ shared willingness to continue strengthening their excellent bilateral relations, based on traditional ties of friendship between the two peoples and countries, 10 legal documents were signed by Cuban and Russian representatives on February 21.The documents are:1. An agreement between the government of the Republic of Cuba and the government of the Russian Federation to regularize the Republic of Cuba’s debt to the Russian Federation for credits given during the era of the former USSR.The two parties reached agreement on aspects of the Cuban debt contracted during the abovementioned period and to confirm it, initialed the document, which allows for the necessary internal procedures in the two countries to effect the agreement.2. An agreement between the government of the Republic of Cuba and the government of the Russian Federation to cooperate in the exploration and utilization of outer space for peaceful ends.The objective of the agreement is to establish and develop mutually beneficial cooperation in the exploration and utilization of outer space and the practical implementation of space equipment and technologies for peaceful ends.3. An agreement between the government of the Republic of Cuba and the government of the Russian Federation on the provision of conditions for buildings covering the needs of the embassy of the Republic of Cuba in Moscow and the embassy and general consulate of the Russian Federation in Havana.The agreement facilitates the rental of buildings for the use of diplomatic missions for a 25-year term. 4. An agreement between the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Investment of the Republic of Cuba and the Federal Customs Service of the Russian Federation on collaboration, information exchange and mutual aid within the framework of the Customs Union Single Tariff Preferences System between Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan. This will contribute to bilateral trade on the basis of facilities offered by the abovementioned Single Tariff Preferences System, by giving Cuba a preferential tariff treaty for commercial exchanges.5. An agreement between the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment of the Republic of Cuba and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation, for cooperation in the field of hydrometeorology and environment monitoring, including the exchange of scientific resources, experts and technical information for the support, improvement and development of scientific and operative research and the meteorological service in the agreed collaboration sectors.6. Memorandum of understanding between the Nuclear Energy and Advanced Technology Agency attached to the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment of the Republic of Cuba and the Rosatom Atomic Energy State Corporation of the Russian Federation, on cooperation in the field of nuclear medicine and the production of radioactive preparations for medical ends.This memo promotes collaboration in the field of nuclear medicine and the production of radioactive preparations for medical ends in sectors defined within the memo, such as the production and use of radioisotopes for diagnoses and radiotherapy, joint production of radio-pharmaceutical preparations, and research7. Memorandum of understanding between the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Cuba and the Ministry of Education and Sciences of the Russian Federation for cooperation in education.This memo will promote cooperation in primary education and general secondary education, as well as basic and secondary professional education. It will also benefit the development of pedagogical scientific projects to increase the quality of education and teacher training.8. Memorandum on collaboration between the National Archive of the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment of the Republic of Cuba and the Federal Archives Agency of the Russian Federation.The parties will exchange work experiences and information on archive management within currents of interest, as well as visits by archive specialists and archive management delegations, based on the principle of reciprocity.9. Leasing agreement with the option of purchasing AN 158 aircraft between the Ilyushin Finance Co., Aviaimport S.A. and the South American Aircraft Leasing Co. Through this document Cuba will lease three AN-158 aircraft from the Ilyushin in order to facilitate air transportation.10. Agreement of Intent for the supply of Russian aeronautics technology and its guarantee between Ilyushin Finance Co. and the Cubana Aviación Corporation.This agreement gives continuity to cooperation maintained in the aeronautics sector and will allow Cubana de Aviación to increase its fleet of aircraft.

### Cuba pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with China

#### Latin America partnering with China

**Ben-Ami, 2013**

(Shlomo, “Is US losing Latin America”, Times of Oman, June 18, <http://www.timesofoman.com/Columns/Article-1173.aspx>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Indeed, at the Summit of the Americas in Cartagena in April 2012, Latin American leaders felt sufficiently confident and united to challenge US priorities in the region. They urged the US to lift its embargo on Cuba, claiming that it had damaged relations with the rest of the continent, and to do more to combat drug use on its own turf, through education and social work, rather than supplying arms to fight the drug lords in Latin America – a battle that all acknowledged has been an utter failure.It is also true that Latin American countries have pursued a massive expansion of economic ties beyond America's sway. China is now Latin America's second-largest trading partner and rapidly closing the gap with the US. India is showing keen interest in the region's energy industry, and has signed export agreements in the defence sector. Iran has strengthened its economic and military ties, especially in Venezuela.

### Cuba pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Iran

#### Iran-Cuba bilateral ties expanding despite Islamic Republic pressures

**Arabia-2000 2013**

(“Iran, Cuba to Expand Bilateral Ties,” Qatar News Agency Distributed, 2-20-13, EBSCOhost, http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=8&sid=167b1d92-6bc3-4254-871b-ef2ab0d5f9f2%40sessionmgr104&hid=105&bdata=JnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#db=nfh&AN=6FI814983555)//KC

Tehran, February 20 (QNA) - Iranian Vice- President for International Affairs Ali Saeedlou and Cuban Vice-President to the Council of Ministers Ricardo Cabrisas held talks on Wednesday to expand the bilateral ties between the two friendly states. The Iranian and Cuban officials in a meeting in Havana called for the development of mutual economic cooperation as the two sides enjoy good political relations. During the meeting, Saeedlou referred to Iran's determination to further enhance relations with Cuba. He also said the two countries will surely remove obstacles to achieve this goal. Saeedlou said there is a bright future for Iran's ties with the friendly and revolutionary countries such as Cuba despite sanctions and pressures exerted on the Islamic Republic. For his part, the Cuban official expressed his country's readiness to promote economic relations with Iran. He said grounds are well prepared for broadening of mutual ties.(QNA)

### Cuba pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with EU

**New accord – signals strengthening economic relationship**

**Cuba News 13** (“EU, Cuba move closer to accord,” *Cuba News,* 6/7/2013,

<http://www.cubanews.com/sections/eu-cuba-move-closer-to-accord>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

The European Union expects to reach a “contractual framework” agreement with Cuba by year’s end, said a top EU official. To date, 14 of the EU’s 27 member states have signed cooperation agreements with the Cuban government. Christian Leffler is director for the Americas at the European External Action Service (EEAS) an agency that’s particularly close to the European Commission and Lady Ashton. Following a recent visit to Havana to negotiate the future characteristics of the EU-Cuba accord, he spoke of a “consensus to move forward” and noted that Cuba is the only country in Latin America lacking such an agreement with Brussels. “We came with our ideas and expressed them,” he said. “We discussed our discrepancies to understand each other’s views and to look for areas of convergence in which we can cooperate bilaterally or at a multilateral level.” Leffler said the EU remains one of Cuba’s top trading partners and ranks first when it comes to foreign investment in Cuba. He added that the island’s proposed new investment law will significantly encourage European investment, and that both parties are working jointly on projects connected to CELAC (Comunidad de Estados de Latinoamérica y el Caribe). In mid-May, Rogelio Sierra, vice-minister of Cuba’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Minrex), signed an accord with his Dutch counterpart, Karen Van Oesterom. The treaty encompasses trade, investments, agriculture, water management, health, biotechnology, culture and sports. The imminent signing of this overall “contractual framework” between the EU and Cuba will render the 10-year-old Posición Común sponsored by former Spanish President José María Aznar obsolete. It’ll also represent Havana’s full normalization of ties with the EU and its member states further isolating Washington when it comes to the Cuba issue

**EU Supports opening trade with Cuba**

**Havana Times 13** (“EU Maintains Stance against Cuba Embargo,” *Havana Times*, 1/22/2013,

<http://www.havanatimes.org/?p=86346>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

HAVANA TIMES — The European Union (EU) reiterated its disapproval of the US blockade against Cuba and said that in the coming EU-CELAC summit it will call for the elimination of the barriers to free trade, reported the Prensa Latina. “The EU doesn’t have the least doubt — as we’ve demonstrated for a long time, as we do year after year — that we are opposed to extraterritorial measures affecting trade, of which one of those cases is Cuba,” said Thomas Dupla del Moral, the director for the Americas Department of the European Service for External Action. In a videoconference, Dupla gave details about the summit to be held on January 26 and 27 in Santiago, Chile, where its theme will focus on investments.

**New agreement with EU and Cuba – negotiations boosting economic relationship**

**Radio Angulo 13** (“Outline Agreement by EU and Cuba,” Radio Angulo, 5/10/13,

<http://www.radioangulo.cu/en/news/cuba/19396-outline-agreement-by-eu-and-cuba.html>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

Christian Leffler, the European Union Director for the Americas described his stay in Cuba as productive, where the aim was the promotion of dialogue to outline an agreement between the two parties, local press reported today. His visit's objective was promoting talks to reach a joint global agreement that can be used as a platform to build further exchanges, Leffler said at a press conference held at EU headquarters in this capital. Leffler favors strengthening the existing links and is pleased the European bloc is an important trade partner for Cuba. "In the economic context, we aim at establishing solid grounds to achieve comprehensive progress between Cuba and the European Union", Leffler noted. Leffler stressed that Cuba is a very appreciated partner in Europe and reaching an agreement with the EU would bring added value for both parties.

### Cuba pursuing protectionist policies – general

#### Cuba protectionist now- it’s general policy

Randall Woods & John Quigley [writing for Bloomberg News] Jan 28, 2013¶ Latin America Commits to Open Trade After Protectionist Year¶ <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-28/latin-america-commits-to-open-trade-after-year-of-protectionism.html>

In the past year Brazil and Argentina have increased trade barriers. Brazil in September boosted [import taxes](http://topics.bloomberg.com/import-taxes/) on 100 products including steel and plastics and Argentina in February required importers to seek authorization from the federal tax agency before purchasing goods abroad.¶ The two countries are in the bottom half of a global standing that ranks countries according to their trade openness. Brazil, which is [Latin America](http://topics.bloomberg.com/latin-america/)’s largest economy, ranks 84th out of 132 nations, followed by Argentina at 96, according to the [World Economic Forum](http://topics.bloomberg.com/world-economic-forum/)’s 2012 report on trade openness.¶ Mercosur’s newest member, Venezuela, is the world’s most closed economy behind Burundi and Chad, according to the WEF report. Venezuelan President [Hugo Chavez](http://topics.bloomberg.com/hugo-chavez/) has nationalized more than 1,000 companies or their assets during his 14 years in office. The Communist island of Cuba, which eschews free enterprise, isn’t in the report.

### Cuba pursuing protectionist policies – Agriculture

#### Cuba pursuing food sovereignty – sustainable agriculture

**Ergas 13** (Christina, “Food Sovereignty: Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba,” Global Research, 3/1/2013, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/food-sovereignty-sustainable-urban-agriculture-in-cuba/5332167>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The agricultural revolution in Cuba has ignited the imaginations of people all over the world. Cuba’s model serves as a foundation for self-sufficiency, resistance to neocolonialist development projects, innovations in agroecology, alternatives to monoculture, and a more environmentally sustainable society. Instead of turning towards austerity measures and making concessions to large international powers during a severe economic downturn, Cubans reorganized food production and worked to gain food sovereignty as a means of subsistence, environmental protection, and national security.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en1) While these efforts may have been born of economic necessity, they are impressive as they have been developed in opposition to a corporate global food regime. In Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba, Sinan Koont indicates that most of the global South has lost any semblance of food sovereignty—the ability to be self-sufficient, to practice a more sustainable form of agriculture, and to direct farming toward meeting the needs of people within a country, rather than producing cash crops for export (187). The World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposed structural adjustment programs and free trade agreements on the so-called third world. These policies increased the influence of multinational corporations, such as Monsanto and Cargill, in global food production. They also encouraged large-scale monocultures, whereby food production is specialized by region for international trade. These policies threatened the national food security of countries in several interrelated ways.[2](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en2) First, economically vulnerable countries are subject to the vagaries of the international marketplace, fluctuating food prices, and heavily subsidized produce from the global North that undermine the ability of the former to compete. Second, in a for-profit economic system, certain crops, like sugarcane, potato, and corn, are planted to produce biofuels, primarily ethanol, instead of food for poor populations. Rich nations that can afford to buy crops for biofuels inflate market prices for food, and when droughts or floods destroy whole harvests, then scarce food still goes to the highest bidder. Third, nations that specialize in cash crops for export must import food, increasing overall insecurity and dependency on trade networks. These nations are more vulnerable to changes in the costs of petroleum, as it influences expenses associated with transportation, fertilizers, pesticides, and the overall price of food. In countries with higher per capita incomes, increasing food costs are an annoyance for many people but not necessarily life threatening. In countries with high rates of poverty, price increases can be devastating. All of the above problems converged during the 2007–2008 food crisis that resulted in riots in Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Mexico, and Bangladesh, just to name a few. People worldwide have been affected by these policies and have fought back. Some nations have taken to task corporations like Monsanto, as in the case of India’s response to genetically modified eggplant, which involved a boycott of Monsanto’s products and demands for the eradication of genetically modified foods.[3](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en3) There are burgeoning local food movements, even in the United States, that despite numerous challenges attempt to produce food outside the current large-scale agricultural paradigm.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en4) There are also international movements that are working to change agricultural policies and practices. For example, La Vía Campesina is an international movement comprised of peasants, small-scale farmers, and their allies. Their primary goals are to stop neoliberal policies that promote oligopolistic corporate control over agriculture and to promote food sovereignty. In conjunction with these movements, Cuba has made remarkable strides toward establishing a system of food sovereignty. One of their most notable projects in this regard is their institutionalized and organized effort to expand agroecological practices, or a system of agriculture that is based on ecological principles and environmental concerns. Cuba has largely transformed food production in order to pursue a more sustainable path. These practices are not limited to the countryside. Cuba is the recognized leader of urban agriculture.[5](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en5) As Koont highlights, the Cuban National Group for Urban Agriculture defines urban agriculture as the production of food within the urban and peri-urban perimeter, using intensive methods, paying attention to the human-crop-animal-environment interrelationships, and taking advantage of the urban infrastructure with its stable labor force. This results in diversified production of crops and animals throughout the year, based on sustainable practices which allow the recycling of waste materials (29). In 2007, urban agriculture comprised approximately 14.6 percent of agriculture in Cuba. Almost all of urban agriculture is organic. Cuba’s environmental protections and agricultural innovations have gained considerable recognition. The 2006 Sustainability Index Report, put together by the World Wildlife Fund by combining the United Nations Human Development Index and Ecological Footprint measures (or natural resource use per capita), contends that the only nation in the world that is living sustainably is Cuba.[6](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en6) The island nation is particularly lauded for its strides in urban food production.[7](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en7) Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba is the first book to take a comprehensive look at this practice around the entire island. Koont indicates that the significance of urban agriculture in Cuba is that although Cuba is not completely food self-sufficient, it is the only example the world has of a country that produces most of its food locally, employing agroecological techniques for production. Furthermore, most of the food produced is for local consumption. As a result, Cuba has one of the shortest producer-to-consumer chains in the world. In this book, Koont documents the impressive transformations that have taken place within this nation. While Cuba imports the majority of its calories and protein, urban agriculture has increased food security and sovereignty in the area of vegetable production. In 2005, Cuba was “importing 60 percent to 70 percent of what it consumes [mostly so-called bulk foods] at an estimated cost of $1.5 billion to $2 billion annually.”[8](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en8) However, urban agriculture within and around Havana accounts for 60–90 percent of the produce consumed in the city and utilizes about 87,000 acres of land.[9](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en9) Cubans employ various forms of urban agriculture, including gardens, reforestation projects, and small-scale livestock operations. In 2010, 75 percent of the Cuban population lived in cities—a city is defined as such if the population is in excess of 1,000 persons.[10](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en10) Thus, urban food production is the most practical and efficient means to supply the population with food. These transformations did not suddenly materialize. Koont provides a useful overview of the historical circumstances that contributed to changes in food production in Cuba. After the 1959 revolution and the subsequent imposition of the U.S. embargo, Cuba became reliant on the Soviet Union. Cubans used large-scale, industrial, monoculture to produce sugar, which was exchanged for Soviet petroleum and currency. The economy was largely tied to high-yield sugar production. In a vicious cycle, this type of agriculture required importing agrochemical fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and oil to run heavy machinery. In 1989, three times more arable land in Cuba was utilized to produce sugar for export than food for national consumption. Most of the Cuban diet came from imported food.[11](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en11) When the Soviet Union collapsed in the early 1990s, Cubans and their economy suffered greatly. Cubans no longer had access to the inputs required to maintain large-scale agriculture, given how dependent such agriculture is on oil. To make matters worse, the end of trade between the Soviet Bloc and Cuba resulted in a loss of access to food, which reduced Cubans’ protein intake by 30 percent.[12](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en12) The system of agriculture that was in place was not sustainable or organized for self-sufficiency. Cubans refer to the ensuing period of resource scarcity as the Special Period in Peace Time. This period included shortages of food, fuel, and medicine. Faced with food scarcity and malnutrition, Cubans had to revamp their food production systems, which included collectively producing a variety of crops in the most efficient manner possible. Additionally, the necessary mission of Cuban politicians, ecologists, farmers, scientists, biologists, and farm workers was to mend the ecological cycles of interdependence that large-scale, exploitative agriculture destroyed.[13](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en13) In spite of these hardships, Cuban society was equipped to contend with the ensuing crisis, given the country’s specific commitments and agroecological projects that were already in operation. The Cuban government and leadership worked to provide institutional support to re-direct food production and to enable the development of an extensive urban agricultural project. Governmental policies, following the 1959 revolution, that prioritized extending education, science, and technology served as a springboard for these new agricultural projects. First, the revolutionary government established organizations to address social problems and concerns. These organizations served as supply and distribution networks for food and centers for research that examined farmers’ traditional knowledge, continuing education programs that taught agroecological practices, distribution of technological innovations, and evaluation of existing programs and operations. Second, the government prioritized human resources and capabilities. Thus, the Cuban government invested in human capital by making education more widely available and accessible at all levels. Making use of the organizational infrastructure and investing in the Cuban people made the agroecological transition possible during the economic crisis in the early 1990s. Koont examines how the early agroecological projects, prior to the Special Period, served as a basis for future development and expansion of the revolutionary transformation of agriculture in Cuba. Science is publicly owned and directed toward furthering human development, rather than capital accumulation. Cuba had the human resources to address food scarcity, given that they had 11 percent of the scientists in Latin America. Scientists were already experimenting with agroecology, in order to take advantage of ecological synergisms, utilizing biodiversity and biological pest control. These efforts were focused on diminishing the need for inputs such as artificial fertilizers and pesticides. Other projects included integrating animals into rotational grazing systems with crops and diversifying with polycultures. Cubans also began recycling sugarcane waste as cattle feed; the cows, in turn, excrete waste that is applied to soil as fertilizer, thereby restoring ecological interdependence. By combining manure with worm castings, Cubans were able to fertilize most of their crops organically without having to import fertilizer from long distances. Their experimentation also included creating urban organopónicos, which were constructed four years before the Soviet collapse. Organopónicos are raised beds of organic materials confined in rectangular walls where plants are grown in areas with poor soil quality. Additionally, personal household plots had long existed within urban areas.[14](http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty#en14) Altogether these experiments and projects served as the foundation to pursue greater self-sufficiency, a system of urban agriculture, and a more sustainable form of food production. The pursuit of food sovereignty has yielded many benefits. Urban agriculture has increased food production, employment, environmental recovery and protection, and community building. Perhaps the most impressive strides are in the area of food security. In the early 1990s, during the Special Period, Cubans’ caloric intake decreased to approximately 1,863 calories a day. In the midst of food scarcity, Cuba ramped up food production. Between 1994 and 2006, Cubans increased urban output by a thousand fold, with an annual growth rate of 78 percent a year. In 2001, Cubans cultivated 18,591 hectares of urban land; in 2006, 52,389 hectares were cultivated. As a result of these efforts, the caloric intake for the population averaged 3,356 calories a day in 2005. During the economic crisis, unemployment sharply increased. However, the creation of extensive urban agricultural programs, which included centers of information and education, provided new jobs that subsumed 7 percent of the workforce and provided good wages. Urban agriculture and reforestation projects also constituted important gains for the environment. Shifting food production away from reliance on fossil fuels and petrochemicals is better for human health and reduces the carbon dioxide emissions associated with food production. Urban reforestation projects provide sinks for air pollution and help beautify cities. Finally, local production of food decreases food miles. It also requires both local producers and consumers. Therefore, community members get to know each other and are responsible for each other through the production and consumption of food. Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba is a detailed documentation of the agroecological transformation in Cuba. Koont delivers a significant amount of information regarding the mechanics of urban agriculture. He highlights the enabling factors of urban agriculture in Cuba, which are the government’s creation of the organizational infrastructure and their investment in human capital. He also provides an assessment of the results from urban agriculture. The results he discusses are gains made in food production, increased employment, environmental recovery and protection, and community building. However, the majority of the book reads like a dry technical manual or guide to urban agriculture, something akin to official Cuban government documents. There are many bulleted lists throughout each chapter that outline types of crops grown, strategies, key features of urban agriculture in Cuba, collaborating organizations, evaluation criteria, tons of produce in each province, program objectives, and the lists go on. While the book contains a significant amount of information regarding process, extent, technology, education, and evaluation surrounding urban agriculture in Cuba, it does little in the way of setting up a theoretical framework and thoroughly exploring the significance of Cuba’s model of urban agriculture for the world. The introduction and the final chapter of the book are the two chapters that touch on Cuba’s relevance and implications. In addition, Koont offers minimal critical analysis of the challenges that Cubans still face in their quest for food sovereignty. Despite these shortcomings, Koont provides a much-needed detailed account of the strides made in Cuban urban agriculture. Cuba’s example has clear implications for food sovereignty and security for the rest of the world. With the very real threat of climate change, potential energy crises, market fluctuations, worldwide droughts, or other economic and environmental problems that may force nations to relocalize food production, this example can serve as a template for future food sovereignty. We can continue to learn from Cuba as they generate new technologies and innovations in organic urban agriculture into the future. In addition, the Cuban example serves as a testament to the potential for a society’s resilience and is worth investigating not just for their innovations, but for inspiration.

### Cuba pursuing protectionist policies – Energy

**Cuba boostering its energy self-sufficiency – doesn’t want dependence**

**Frank 13** (Marc, “Stunned Cuba ponders future without Chavez,” *Reuters*, 3/5/2013, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/06/us-venezuela-chavez-cuba-idUSBRE92505320130306>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

ECONOMIC DEPENDENCE Most Cuban economists point out that the economy has become more diversified over the last 20 years with the development of tourism, [pharmaceuticals](http://www.reuters.com/sectors/industries/overview?industryCode=160&lc=int_mb_1001) and increased oil and nickel production. But they say it remains far too dependent on Venezuela. Cuba and Venezuela have formed more than 30 joint ventures over the years, most of them based in Venezuela. They range from a [fishing](http://www.reuters.com/sectors/industries/overview?industryCode=113&lc=int_mb_1001) fleet, to port and rail repair, to [hotels](http://www.reuters.com/sectors/industries/overview?industryCode=88&lc=int_mb_1001), agriculture, nickel and [steel](http://www.reuters.com/sectors/industries/overview?industryCode=22&lc=int_mb_1001) production and just about all of Cuba's downstream oil industry. In 2011, Venezuela accounted for $8.3 billion of Cuba's $20 billion in foreign trade. It pays Cuba an estimated $6 billion or more annually for the services of 40,000 doctors, nurses and other professionals, local economists say. That is around 60 percent of the foreign exchange Cuba earned from services. Venezuelan banks provide soft credits for dozens of development projects across the island. Venezuela serves as a guarantor for investment and trade with the island. While many Cubans fretted, others were more optimistic that Chavez's hand-picked successor, Vice President Nicolas Maduro, would win the election that must now take place within 30 days. UNCERTAINTY AND REFORM Cuba is in the process of lifting some restrictions on civil liberties and revamping the state-dominated economy into a more mixed and market friendly one. Experts said that regardless of the election's outcome the pace and depth of reform would most likely pick up. An opposition victory, viewed as unlikely, would certainly force Havana to scamper, they said, and while a Maduro win would spell no changes for Cuba in the short term, the threat of instability in Venezuela's future would loom large on local leaders' minds. "Assuming that Maduro is elected, Venezuela will continue its critical oil subsidies, but both international credit [markets](http://www.reuters.com/finance/markets?lc=int_mb_1001) and the Cuban leadership can now more clearly see a future where Cuba will have to bolster its energy self-sufficiency and improve its credit ratings," said Carlos Saladrigas, head of the Cuba Study Group, a Cuban American business organization that advocates engagement with Havana. "The pro-reform factions within the Cuban system will have additional arguments in their quiver for moving forward with all deliberate speed," he said. Mora agreed that mid-term instability in Venezuela would be Cuba's biggest challenge. "I think everyone will try and unite behind Maduro. It's what becomes of Venezuela after, and whether Maduro can keep all the disparate factions within Chavismo together for a long period of time, especially if the Venezuelan economy runs into macro-economic troubles and it's not able to continue subsidizing political support (for Cuba)," he said.

**Cuba becoming more energy independent – both imports and production**

**LaGesse 12** (David, “Cuba's Oil Quest to Continue, Despite Deepwater Disappointment,” *National Geographic*, 11/19/2012,

<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/11/121119-cuba-oil-quest/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

But Cuba's disappointing foray into deepwater doesn't end its quest for energy.  The nation produces domestically only about half the oil it consumes. As with every aspect of its economy, its choices for making up the shortfall are sorely limited by the 50-year-old United States trade embargo. At what could be a time of transition for Cuba, experts agree that the failure of deepwater exploration increases the Castro regime's dependence on the leftist government of Venezuela, which has been meeting fully half of Cuba's oil needs with steeply subsidized fuel. (Related: "[Cuba's New Now](http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2012/11/new-cuba/gorney-text)") And it means Cuba will continue to seek out a wellspring of energy independence without U.S. technology, greatly increasing both the challenges, and the risks.

### Venezuela pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Cuba

#### Venezuela-Cuba verify excellent state of bilateral relations

**BBC Worldwide Monitoring 2013**

(“Cuban leader, Venezuelan speaker discuss ties,” 6-11-13, LexisNexis, 7-8-13, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)//KC

The two leaders verified the excellent state of bilateral relations and held a fruitful exchange on topics on the regional and international agendas. The Army General ratified Cuba's invariable support for the Bolivarian Revolution, and highlighted its contribution to Latin American and Caribbean integration. Raul praised the efforts of the Venezuelan government, under the leadership of President Nicolas Maduro, to guarantee the continuity of the work of late President Hugo Chavez and preserve the irreversible achievements of the people of that fraternal nation. Participating in the meeting was Foreign Minister Bruno Rodriguez.

#### Mexico and Venezuela major trading partners- linked by bilateral trade agreements now

Monica Hirst [Brazilian-U.S. expert in international affairs based ¶ in Buenos Aires. She is a professor in the Department of Economics ¶ and Administration at Quilmes National University and teaches in ¶ the master’s programme in international relations at Torcuato Di ¶ Tella University]¶ Cuban-Latin American and Caribbean ¶ relations: challenges beyond ¶ normalization¶ June 2013¶ <http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/4ddd027eb8853fc6b6464705b630c332.pdf>

Primarily based on personal friendship and deep ideological affinities, the Castro-Chávez connection was central to ¶ legitimising the Bolivarian socialist project, promoting the ¶ ALBA group (2004), and unblocking communications ¶ between leftist guerrilla groups and the government in ¶ Colombia. Cuban military advisers in Venezuela became ¶ crucial for local intelligence activities and involved direct ¶ participation in presidential logistics, weapons training and ¶ shared anti-U.S. strategic planning.6¶ In 2011 trade with ¶ Venezuela represented 38% of total Cuban exchanges, ¶ while in Latin America the partnership with Venezuela ¶ represented 81% of Cuba’s trade with the region. The ¶ bilateral accord introduced in 2003 set preferential pricing ¶ for the export of Cuban professional services (mainly ¶ medical) in exchange for the provision of oil and joint ¶ investments in strategic areas, plus the provision of ¶ generous credit lines.7

#### Cuba-Venezuela bilateral ties increasing- new Raul-Maduro regime

**Arabia-2000 2013**

(“Cuba, Venezuela Sign Deals Worth Two Billion Dollars,” Qatar News Agency, 4-29-13, EBSCOhost, 7-8-13, http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=8&sid=167b1d92-6bc3-4254-871b-ef2ab0d5f9f2%40sessionmgr104&hid=105&bdata=JnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#db=nfh&AN=6FI2856687700)//KC

Havana, April 29 (QNA) - Cuba and Venezuela have signed here accords for 51 joint projects worth two billion US dollars. At the close of 13th Cuba-Venezuela Intergovernmental Meeting, Cuban President Raul Castro and Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro announced the deals for projects in such areas as education, health, sports, culture, food production, construction, transport, communications, energy and support of social missions. Havana and Caracas agreed to jointly invest two billion dollars to develop these projects and also signed a memorandum to establish a bilateral medium- and long-term economic agenda. The investment also covers joint ventures in vital and strategic economic areas in both countries. Venezuela and Cuba became close political and economic allies after Chavez took office in 1999. Venezuela sends around 130,000 barrels of oil to Cuba each day, while Havana provides professional personnel needed by Venezuela's social programs. (QNA)

#### Cuba-Venezuela economic ties high and set to continue

**BBC Worldwide Monitoring 2013**

(“Cuban, Venezuelan presidents praise friendship, cooperation,” 5-2-13, LexisNexis, 7-8-13, http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/)//KC

"It is the path of unity, duty and true integration of Latin American and Caribbean peoples", said the Venezuelan President in the last-night speech during the closure of the meeting, which was followed by Cuban President Raul Castro's speech. Maduro said that both sides agreed an important amount of joint investment, 2 billion USD, for economic and industrial development, culture, health, education and food production, besides the creation of joint companies to take on the development of vital and strategic areas of those countries' economy. The Venezuelan President highlighted as a result of mutual cooperation the creation of 6,712 medical posts for the people and 571 integral centres of health, 583 integral rehabilitation centres and 35 high-technology centres. Due to the bilateral cooperation, 40, 000 Cuban doctors have served in Venezuela and 1,756,261 Venezuelans learnt to read and write. In his speech, President Raul Castro pointed out that Chavez was, as Fidel said, Cuba's best friend. He was an inspiring and restless fighter for the consolidation of the Bolivarian Alliance of the Peoples for our America (ALBA), he said. Cuban President also said that a remarkable result of the meeting has been the sign of the Memorandum of Agreement which settles an economic agenda for medium and long terms. Ministers of both countries signed 3 agreements on culture, health and education, besides the Memorandum of Agreement and the Final Proceedings of the 13th meeting. The last two documents were signed by the co-presidents of that work group, the vice president of the Council of Ministers for Territorial Development and the Venezuelan minister for Petroleum and Mining, Rafael Ramirez, and the Cuban minister for Foreign Trade and Foreign Investments, Rodrigo Malmierca.

### Venezuela pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Brazil

#### Brazil-Venezuela commerce high and projected to stay that way

**Kroth 2013**

(Olivia, Pravda journalist, “Venezuela and Brazil strengthen their cooperation,”pravada.ru, 4-9-13, 7-9-13, http://english.pravda.ru/history/09-04-2013/124239-venezuela\_brasil-0/)//KC

In June 2011, Hugo Chávez met with Dilma Rousseff in Brasilia to discuss further cooperation in the areas of energy, finance and housing. They signed 14 agreements. In December of the same year, Dilma Rousseff visited Caracas to sign another 11 agreements in energy, housing, science and technology. It was her first state visit to Venezuela as Brazilian President. "Brazil and Venezuela are on a new level of integration, which is productive and brings economic growth for our nations," Dilma Rousseff pointed out. Hugo Chávez and Dilma Rousseff revised earlier accords and made new plans for the future. "We have accomplished a million things in this decade," Hugo Chávez announced with great pride. In 2011, commerce and trade between both countries grew by more than 20 percent. Brazil's exports to Venezuela amounted to 3.5 billion USD, a 14 percent increase, while Venezuela's exports to Brazil reached one billion USD, a 48 percent increase. Nicolás Maduro hopes to augment Venezuela's exports to Brazil considerably in the next presidential term, between 2013 and 2019.

#### Maduro pursuing bilateral agreements with Brazil

**Best News U.S. 2013**

(“Maduro first visit to Brazil want to strengthen economic and technical cooperation between the two countries,” 5-10-13, 7-9-13, http://www.best-news.us/news-4468903-Maduro-first-visit-to-Brazil-want-to-strengthen-economic-and-technical-cooperation-between-the-two-countries.html)//KC

International Online reports (Reporter Zeng Yun: local, Venezuelan President Maduro's visit to Brazil, held talks in Brasilia with Brazilian President Rosoff talks, both sides have expressed hope to continue to strengthen economic and technical cooperation. This is President Maduro first visit to Brazil. Talks for nearly two hours. Joint news conference after the meeting, Rousseff said that Brazil and Venezuela, bilateral trade volume reached a new record in 12 years $ 6 billion, for 13 years, both countries hope to continue to maintain this momentum to further strengthen economic and technical cooperation. Rosoff said: 'Today, we reaffirm the strategic partnership between the two countries, we have decided to continue to promote the existing bilateral cooperation projects, such as food, electricity, petroleum, agriculture, social development and housing, we also explored new cooperative projects in terms of both food safety and supply, as well as the power to protect(http://www.best-news.us/). '

### Venezuela pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Ecuador

**Ecuador pursuing economic bilateral ties with Venezuela**

**AVN 13** (“Ecuador to deepen relations with Venezuela and the ALBA,” 5/24/2013, *AVN*, <http://www.avn.info.ve/contenido/ecuador-deepen-relations-venezuela-and-alba>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Caracas, 24 May. AVN.- Ecuador's ambassador to Venezuela, Leonardo Arizaga, said on Friday that the new government of President Rafael Correa will intensify bilateral relations with Venezuela and unity with the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (ALBA). "In the coming years we will deepen the relationship with Venezuela, we will intensify the work with ALBA, not only in political area but also economic and commercial fields, we will develop more projects in the financial sector," said the diplomat in a press conference in Caracas. In this sense, Arizaga highlighted the Unitary System of Regional Compensation (Sucre) as "an essential tool" in trade with Venezuela, through the use of local currencies and central banks of both countries. Ecuador's Rafael Correa, who took office on Friday, began a new four-year term after being re-elected on February 17th with 57.17% of the vote. The ambassador stressed that "the popular mandate of Rafael Correa is very clear, re-elected by a large majority," who also supported the Citizen Revolution with the election of 100 of the 137 assembly seats in the parliament of Ecuador. "We will work together with Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro," said Arizaga, who added that this relationship will focus four areas: diplomatic policy coordination to strengthen the Latin American region in international fora, the intensification of bilateral trade for Venezuela to be one of Ecuador's main trading partners, the strengthening of joint cooperation projects and the work with Ecuadorians living in Venezuela and Venezuelans living in Ecuador. "These four areas will be essential in the relations between our two countries in the next four years, not only bilaterally but multilaterally in the context of Alba, UNASUR and CELAC," said the ambassador.

**Venezuela and Ecuador share commerce and economic ties**

**The Heritage Foundation 13** (“2013 Index of Economic Freedom,” *The Heritage Foundation*, 7/9/2013,

<http://www.heritage.org/index/country/ecuador>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The overall investment climate has become increasingly risky because of the repressive political environment. The restrictive trade regime is reducing competition and eroding productivity. By controlling flows of trade and investment, the government has been forcing closer economic and commercial ties with Venezuela and China. Re-elected in 2009, President Rafael Correa has ended free trade negotiations with the U.S and has threatened to force a renegotiation of Ecuador’s foreign debt. Constitutional amendments passed in 2011 increased Correa’s control of the media and the judicial system. Correa has also worked to undercut the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, is aligned with Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez, and has broadened Ecuador’s links with Iran. Oil revenues and borrowing from China have counterbalanced declining foreign investment and continued capital flight. Economic growth has been moderate. Ecuador is the world’s largest banana exporter and has significant petroleum reserves, and Correa has stiffened contract terms with foreign producers and advanced resource nationalism. Over 50 percent of the population lives below the poverty line.

### Venezuela pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Russia

#### Venezuela pursuing bilateral partnership with Russia- energy companies

**Wilson 2013**

(Elliot, a London-based free-lance writer, specializing in global finance, economics and business, “Russia: Hand in hand ,” March/April 2013, EBSCOhost, 7-8-13, http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2063/ehost/detail?vid=28&sid=58ce056b-7612-4d55-ae52-2ae1d72c4175%40sessionmgr113&hid=115&bdata=JnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#db=bft&AN=86872740)//KC

Under president Vladimir Putin, however, Russia is more petrostate than ideologue. So it is little surprise that most trade between Moscow and South America involves energy-heavy deals. One major partnership is between Russian and Venezuelan state energy companies to develop the Junin 6 block on Venezuela's eastern Orinoco River. Rosneft is to take over as chief operator of the project, which is worth as much as $50 billion and involves PDVSA, Gazprom and Lukoil, among others. The Russian partners are likely to spend up to $17.6 billion over the next eight years on the project. Rosneft will put up more than half of that, Venezuelan energy minister and PDVSA chief executive Rafael Ramírez has said. If all goes to plan, total oil output from Russia's investments in the Junin 6 block should nearly quintuple to 1.123 million barrels a day by 2021. The Rosneft deal stands out for its size, but it is not alone. In October 2011, TNK-BP, now 50% owned by Rosneft, paid $1.25 billion for a 45% stake in 21 blocks in Brazil's Solimões Basin. Growth potential

#### Russia-Venezuela bilateral relations on the rise post-Chavez

**Interfax 2013**

(“Putin sends condolences to Venezuelan people over Chavez's death,” Russia & FSU News Bulletin, 3-6-13, EBSCOhost, 7-8-13, http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=34&sid=167b1d92-6bc3-4254-871b-ef2ab0d5f9f2%40sessionmgr104&hid=105&bdata=JnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#db=bwh&AN=85934109)//KC

MOSCOW. March 6 (Interfax) - Russian President Vladimir Putin has sent his condolences to the Venezuelan people over President Hugo Chavez's death and says he is convinced that Russia and Venezuela should continue to strengthen their bilateral relations, the Kremlin press service reported on Wednesday. Putin addressed his "sincere condolences" to Venezuelan Vice President Nicolas Maduro and all Venezuelan people, calling Chavez "an outstanding leader and manager and Russia's close friend." "Vladimir Putin highly praised the Venezuelan leader's personal efforts that helped lay a solid foundation of Russian-Venezuelan partnership, arrange active political contacts and launch far-reaching humanitarian and economic projects and expressed his conviction of the need to further follow this way, strengthening and developing the relationship between Russia and Venezuela," it said. Putin, who met with Chavez on numerous occasions, mentioned his qualities. "This was an extraordinary and strong man who looked to the future and always set the highest possible standard for himself," he said. "The Russian president emphasized that fortitude and vital energy typical for Venezuelans will help them overcome the tribulations that have befallen them and continue the noble cause of creating a strong, independent and prospering Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela," the Kremlin press service said. Medvedev sends condolences to Venezuela over Chavez's death MOSCOW. March 6 (Interfax) - Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev has conveyed his condolences over Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez's death, the government press service said on Wednesday. In a telegram to Venezuelan Vice President Nicolas Maduro, Medvedev expressed his sincere condolences on behalf of the Russian government and on his personal behalf on the death of "Comandante Hugo Chavez, an outstanding politician and statesman and a great friend of Russia," it said. "All Chavez's life is an example of selfless service to the Venezuelan people and fight for justice and equality. We share the pain of your loss and will always remember this remarkable man, patriot and citizen," Medvedev said. The Russian premier suggested that it is hard to overestimate Chavez's personal contribution to strengthening Russian-Venezuelan partnership. "It is in large part owing to his energy and purposefulness that major joint projects in the energy, industry, high technology, transport infrastructure, agriculture and other sectors are being pursued," he said. "I am sure that further development of bilateral cooperation fully meets Russia's and Venezuela's fundamental interests," Medvedev said. He asked Maduro to convey his words of sympathy and support to Chavez's relatives and beloved ones. Sechin, Manturov, Chemezov to represent Russia at Chavez's funeral

### Venezuela pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with China

#### Latin America partnering with China

**Ben-Ami, 2013**

(Shlomo, “Is US losing Latin America”, Times of Oman, June 18, <http://www.timesofoman.com/Columns/Article-1173.aspx>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Indeed, at the Summit of the Americas in Cartagena in April 2012, Latin American leaders felt sufficiently confident and united to challenge US priorities in the region. They urged the US to lift its embargo on Cuba, claiming that it had damaged relations with the rest of the continent, and to do more to combat drug use on its own turf, through education and social work, rather than supplying arms to fight the drug lords in Latin America – a battle that all acknowledged has been an utter failure.It is also true that Latin American countries have pursued a massive expansion of economic ties beyond America's sway. China is now Latin America's second-largest trading partner and rapidly closing the gap with the US. India is showing keen interest in the region's energy industry, and has signed export agreements in the defence sector. Iran has strengthened its economic and military ties, especially in Venezuela.

### Venezuela pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with Iran

#### Venezuela-Iran partnership in economic agreements strengthened

**Ben-Ami, 2013**

(Shlomo, “Is US losing Latin America”, Times of Oman, June 18, <http://www.timesofoman.com/Columns/Article-1173.aspx>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Indeed, at the Summit of the Americas in Cartagena in April 2012, Latin American leaders felt sufficiently confident and united to challenge US priorities in the region. They urged the US to lift its embargo on Cuba, claiming that it had damaged relations with the rest of the continent, and to do more to combat drug use on its own turf, through education and social work, rather than supplying arms to fight the drug lords in Latin America – a battle that all acknowledged has been an utter failure.It is also true that Latin American countries have pursued a massive expansion of economic ties beyond America's sway. China is now Latin America's second-largest trading partner and rapidly closing the gap with the US. India is showing keen interest in the region's energy industry, and has signed export agreements in the defence sector. Iran has strengthened its economic and military ties, especially in Venezuela.

### Venezuela pursuing free trade agreements – through bilateral trade agreements with EU

**Despite tension – trade agreements over energy and business relationship intact**

**Gratius 12** (Susanne, pecialist in EU-Latin America relations at the Madrid-based think tank FRIDE, “Global Insider: EU-Venezuela Ties Distant but Cordial,” *World Politics Review*, 4/25/2012, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/trend-lines/11887/global-insider-eu-venezuela-ties-distant-but-cordial>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Venezuela [threatened in early April](http://www.eluniversal.com/nacional-y-politica/120403/venezuelan-government-balks-at-eu-steps-against-conviasa) to retaliate against a European Union decision to ban Venezuelan state airline Conviasa from flying in the EU. In an email interview, [Susanne Gratius](http://www.fride.org/expert/21/susanne-gratius), a specialist in EU-Latin America relations at the Madrid-based think tank FRIDE, discussed EU-Venezuela relations.  WPR: What is the history of European Union-Venezuela relations under President Hugo Chavez?  Susanne Gratius: Relations are distant but cordial. Unlike U.S. policy, there are no diplomatic tensions or open conflicts between the EU and the government of Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez. Despite limited mutual interests, the EU has become the main donor and a principal external actor for Venezuela. In 2002, the EU (with the exception of Spain) condemned the coup attempt against Chávez and supported the Organization of American States' efforts at facilitating a dialogue between Chávez and the opposition.  Since Venezuela left the Andean Community in 2006 and is not yet a full member of Mercosur, the bilateral dialogue channels have been unintentionally paralyzed. In the past, there have been some tensions between Spain and Venezuela, but relations have been fully re-established and continue to be cordial under the current government of Spanish Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy. From time to time the EU criticizes political tensions, polarization and human rights violations in Venezuela, but no action has been taken, and relations are following the path of business as usual.  WPR: What is the extent of trade and investment between Venezuela and EU countries, and in what sectors?   Gratius: European investment in Venezuela is concentrated in the energy sector, both oil and gas. France, Spain and the U.K. are the main European investors, and Spain in particular has a close economic relationship with Venezuela. Apart from the energy sector, Spain is also present in the financial sector, communications and tourism. Venezuela is not a major trade partner of the EU and has not signed any free trade agreements with Brussels. Exports from Venezuela concentrate on oil, while industrial products and services are the main imports from Europe.  WPR: How do EU-Venezuela ties fit into the context of wider EU-Latin America relations?  Gratius: Venezuela is a full member of the Ibero-American Community and the EU-Latin American "system." It participates in the Ibero-American Summits and the EU-Latin American Community Summits without any restrictions. Since Venezuela left the Andean Community and the EU has not established a dialogue with the Union of South American Nations, political relations are limited to the summits and the recently created Latin American and Caribbean Community of States. Despite its democracy clause, the EU believes that Latin America should decide who participates in the political dialogues, and even Cuba is not excluded from either forum. Since it is an oil-exporting and medium-income country, Venezuela has no prominent role in development cooperation.

**Trade between Venezuela and the EU remains a priority**

**European Union 13** (“Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela,” *European Union External Action*, <http://eeas.europa.eu/venezuela/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

EU relations and cooperation with Venezuela are carried out on a regional and bilateral basis.

At regional level, relations are ongoing within the framework of the [institutional dialogue between the European Union and the Rio Group](http://eeas.europa.eu/la/riogroup_en.htm). In 2012 Venezuela became a full member of Mercosur and has thus joined the dialogue and negotiations between the EU and [Mercosur](http://eeas.europa.eu/mercosur/index_en.htm). [Trade](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2006/september/tradoc_113462.pdf) between the EU and Venezuela remains an important subject of relations. The 2007-2013 [Country Strategy Paper](http://eeas.europa.eu/venezuela/csp/07_13_en.pdf) outlined the main axes of financial bilateral cooperation with Venezuela. Two specific sectors had been identified: support to the modernization of the State and its institutions; diversification of the economy. In line with other middle-income countries, as of 2014, Venezuela will no longer benefit from bilateral cooperation.

### Venezuela pursuing protectionist policies – general

#### Venezuela protectionist now- petrochemical industry

Nick Hastings [writing for Wall Street Journal Money Beat]¶ June 14, 2013¶ Can’t Win a Currency War? Try Protectionism Instead¶ <http://blogs.wsj.com/moneybeat/2013/06/14/cant-win-a-currency-war-try-protectionism-instead/>

As financial markets sputter and the global recovery once again comes into question, countries are looking for a new way to stimulate growth.¶ And some of them appear to have already found it: protectionism.¶ According to the latest report from Global Trade Alert, an independent monitoring group, the incidence of protectionist policies in one form of another has risen over the last six months to its highest level since the start of the global financial crisis in 2008.¶ “In our last report, published in June 2012, our first estimate of the number of protectionist measures imposed in the second quarter of 2012 was just 26.5. In this report, our first counts for the fourth quarter of 2012 and the first quarter of 2013 are almost five times higher, at 127 and 125, respectively,” the GTA report said.¶ The most high profile of these include [the euro zone’s trade spats with China over German solar panels and French wine](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324063304578524872515204946.html) but they stretch all the way to less headline-making laws in Venezuela on developing the petrochemical industry and a Colombian tariff on imported milk and cream.

#### Venezuela has an anti business environment now

Susan Kaufman Purcell¶ [Director, Center for Hemispheric Policy¶ University of Miami]¶ JUNE 2013¶ LATIN AMERICA’S SUPPORT FOR ROBERTO AZEVEDO¶ <https://umshare.miami.edu/web/wda/hemisphericpolicy/Publications/June%202013%20-%20Reasons%20for%20Support%20(USE).pdf>

Mercosur, in contrast, is in decline. It peaked about 15 ¶ years ago, when exports within the bloc accounted for ¶ about 25% of trade among its members. During the past ¶ decade, this figure has fallen to around 15%. Argentina ¶ and Brazil have become considerably more protectionist ¶ in recent years, using tariffs, taxes and other measures to ¶ protect their domestic economies against each other and ¶ against foreign competitors. Furthermore, Mercosur has ¶ to negotiate as a bloc and has signed few free trade ¶ agreements with other countries or regions. Those that it ¶ has signed are basic and seem to have been signed more ¶ for ideological reasons. For much of its existence,¶ Mercosur was committed to admitting only democratic ¶ countries. The expulsion of Paraguay for undemocratic ¶ behavior, and the inclusion of Venezuela, despite its ¶ undemocratic behavior, have weakened the group’s ¶ democratic identity. In addition, in Argentina and ¶ Venezuela the rules and regulations affecting business,¶ investment and private property have become arbitrary ¶ and easily changed. As a result, foreign investment in ¶ both countries has been declining.

### Venezuela pursuing protectionist policies – Agriculture

#### Venezeuala pursing general protectionism and anti-free trade environment now

[Evodio Kaltenecker](http://estrategiaparatodos.wordpress.com/) [¶ Professor Executive MBA Program at[BBS Business School](http://www.linkedin.com/company/bbs-business-school?trk=ppro_cprof)¶ Visting Lecturer at [Ibmec Business School](http://www.linkedin.com/company/ibmec-business-school?trk=ppro_cprof)¶ Visiting Lecturer at [iPL - Institute of Performance and Leadership](http://www.linkedin.com/company/ipl---institute-of-performance-and-leadership?trk=ppro_cprof)¶ Member of the Advisory Board at Corr Analytics Inc---¶ Writing for Corr Analytics-- provides analysis to government and business clients, with a focus on strategic and international political risk. Areas of expertise include international conflict, Asia, and quantitative analysis]¶ [Political Risk in Latin America and the Caribbean: smart move from nimble players, a few populists, and a giant that misses one more opportunity](http://www.canalyt.com/political-risk-in-latin-america-and-the-caribbean-smart-move-from-nimble-players-a-few-populists-and-a-giant-that-misses-one-more-opportunity/)¶ Journal of Political Risk, Vol. 1, No. 2, June 2013.¶ <http://www.canalyt.com/category/protectionism/>

The latest events in Latin America and the Caribbean provide good examples of the current political and economic tone in the region. On one hand, small and mid-sized economies such as Peru, Colombia, Chile and Mexico are working towards the advancement of the Pacific Alliance – an economic group whose agenda includes free trade and economic integration. On the other hand, a group of not-so-small economies still linger with populist recipes for government intervention, nationalization of companies, and manipulation of published government economic data.¶ The Pacific Alliance, an economic bloc which has a clear orientation towards Asia, is a market-oriented response to Mercosur (an economic and political agreement with several internal conflicts over trade policy). The Alliance is formed by Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Peru. Under the surprising presidency of Ollanta Humala, Peru has advocated free-market policies. From a political risk perspective, there has been no clear evidence that the Pacific Alliance adds risk of adverse government laws or actions such as regulations, protectionism, profit repatriation restrictions, expropriation, or nationalization. On the contrary, the Pacific Alliance has worked to provide a positive business climate among Alliance members because it is focused on trade, investment and immigration rather than politics and ideology. For example: Mexico has dropped visa requirements for Colombians and Peruvians; the four Alliance countries signed an agreement removing tariffs on 90% of their merchandise trade; and the stock market of Chile, Peru and Colombia have merged to create MILA (Mercado Integrado Latinoamericano).¶ On the other hand, the same cannot be said of Argentina, Ecuador, Venezuela and Bolivia, which in some degree or another have scared foreign investors with populist-oriented policies. Countries of this league have shown more political turmoil than stability or economic growth. Political risks in this group are complicated, but are typified by political unease and food shortages in Venezuela, nationalization of assets in Argentina and Bolivia, restrictions of media groups in Argentina and Ecuador, and manipulation of the inflation index in Argentina.

### Venezuela pursuing protectionist policies – Energy

**Venezuela threatening to take protectionist measures in the energy sector**

**Channel News Asia 13** (“Venezuela threatens oil, trade measures in vote row with US,” *Channel News Asia*, 4/23/2013, <http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/world/venezuela-threatens-oil-trade-measures-i/647850.html>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

CARACAS: Venezuela threatened on Monday to take measures affecting energy and trade if the United States resorts to sanctions in a row over the disputed presidential election in Caracas earlier this month. "If the United States takes recourse to economic sanctions, or sanctions of any other kind, we will take measures of a commercial, energy, economic and political order that we consider necessary," Foreign Minister Elias Jaua warned in a television interview. The warning came amid a political crisis in Venezuela over opposition demands for a recount of April 14 election returns that gave President Nicolas Maduro a narrow win to replace the late Hugo Chavez. US Assistant Secretary of State Roberta Jacobson was reported over the weekend to have urged a recount in order to give the public confidence in the outcome, which has been challenged by opposition candidate Henrique Capriles. Asked whether the United States would impose sanctions if Venezuela refused to recount the votes, Jacobson said she could not say one way or another, according to CNN en Espanol. In the interview from Quito, Ecuador with Telesur, a state-financed regional television network, Jaua said Venezuela held the United States responsible for post-election violence that left eight people dead. "You can be certain that in the face of sanctions of any kind we will respond with economic , political, diplomatic actions to defend the sacred right of the will of the Venezuelan people," he said. The United States imports some 900,000 barrels of oil a day from Venezuela, which produces between 2.3 million and three million barrels a day. Venezuela sits atop the world's largest proven crude oil reserves.

# Uniqueness – Institution Specific

### Protectionism increasing – general

#### World trade is on the decline and protectionism is increasing – non-tariff barriers

Solis and Vaisse 2013 (1-17-13, “Free Trade Game Changer,” Mireya Solís is the Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies and senior fellow at the Brookings Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, and associate professor at American University, Justin Vaïsse became the director of the policy planning staff in the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/free-trade-game-changer>)

Pursuing and signing free trade agreements (FTAs) with both the Asia-Pacific region and Europe during your second administration will yield considerable economic and political benefits. World trade is expected to have stalled at a mere 2.5 percent growth in 2012, down from 13.8 percent in 2010. Protectionism is on the rise everywhere, especially in the form of non-tariff barriers. The Doha Round is essentially dead. At the same time, the United States and Europe need to stimulate their economies without resorting to fiscal spending. Furthermore, the United States needs to establish a broader and deeper economic presence in Asia, the world’s most dynamic economic region. Achieving both a Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and a Trans-Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (TAFTA) is the most realistic way to reclaim U.S. economic leadership and make progress towards your promised goal of doubling U.S. exports. Moreover, signing both the TPP and TAFTA would have deep strategic implications. Both deals would reaffirm liberal norms and a leading U.S. role in setting the global rules of the road. The TPP would help define the standard for economic integration in Asia, without necessarily antagonizing China. TAFTA would give American and European businesses an edge in setting industrial standards for tomorrow’s global economy.

#### Protectionism High now- G8 nations measures prove

**Evenett,** professor of international trade and economic development at the University of St Gallen, Switzerland, **2013** (Simon, "The quiet return of global protectionism," June 13, [http://www.businessspectator.com.au/article/2013/6/13/global-news/quiet-return-global- protectionism/](http://www.businessspectator.com.au/article/2013/6/13/global-news/quiet-return-global-%20protectionism/), accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Nowadays, many governments are adept at tilting the playing field in a way that their trading partners, the media, and analysts find hard to track. Over the past year, beggar-thy-neighbour policies have made a quiet but significant resurgence. The first estimates of the amount of protectionism imposed in the fourth quarter 2012 and the first quarter 2013 are the worst that the Global Trade Alert team has compiled since November 2008, much worse than in the first quarter 2009 when policymakers lost sleep about protectionism.¶ The holder of this year’s G8 presidency, the UK, has made combating protectionism a priority and this report has been compiled and released just before the G8 Summit in Lough Erne, Northern Ireland, on June 17-18. However, concerns about protectionism are not confined to the UK. In April, when introducing reduced forecasts for world trade growth, the director-general of the World Trade Organisation, Pascal Lamy, warned that the protectionist threat may be greater now than at any time since the onset of the global economic crisis. On the basis of the evidence presented here, Lamy’s concerns were well founded.¶ Building on a massive update of the Global Trade Alert, that saw 904 new entries added to the Global Trade Alert database which now comprises 3334 reports on government measures, this report provides a comprehensive overview of the current state of protectionist and trade liberalising dynamics. The principal findings of this report are: – Protectionism’s made a quiet resurgence. The initial counts of protectionism imposed in the fourth quarter 2012 and the first quarter 2013 are the worst since the financial crisis began. – 431 new protectionist measures were imposed in the year June 2012-May 2013, substantially outnumbering the 141 commerce-liberalising measures implemented. A further 183 protectionist measures are in the pipeline. – G8 nations were responsible for 30 per cent of protectionist measures imposed during the past 12 months. When the rest of the G20 are included, the largest economies in the world are responsible for 65 per cent of all protectionism imposed since June 2012. – Half of the past year’s protectionism has harmed at least one G8 member. Having a large economy is no shield against protectionism. In the past year alone G8 commercial interests have been hit often by others’ protectionism, ranging from 70 hits for Russia and Canada to 146 blows to US commercial interests. – As so little crisis protectionism has been unwound, the harm to G8 interests keeps piling up. Every G8 member, except Russia and Canada, has seen their exporters, investors, and nationals working abroad harmed more than 500 times since November 2008. US commercial interests have been harmed 784 times. – Non-G8 member China is the nation most frequently harmed by foreign protectionism. China’s interests have been hit just under 1000 times since November 2008. – Traditional forms of protectionism, which are subject to tougher WTO rules, still represent less than half of all beggar-thy-neighbour measures. The loopholes in trade rules have meant that smart governments don’t need to openly flout the WTO.¶ Since so much crisis-era protectionism is not transparent, the Global Trade Alert team has come to expect low initial counts of the number of beggar-thy-neighbour measures implemented in the most recent quarters. The last quarter of 2012 and the first quarter of 2013 broke the mould, as shown in [[Figure Removed]] In our last report, published in June last year, our first estimate of the number of protectionist measures imposed in the second quarter of 2012 was just 26. In this report, our first count for the fourth quarter 2012 and the first quarter 2013 are almost five times higher, at 127 and 125 respectively. These are the highest first counts of the number of protectionist measures for recently concluded quarters that the GTA has ever found. To see this, the worst quarter so far in the crisis-era in terms of protectionism imposed was the first quarter 2009, when the first count was 77. Subsequently, another 100 or so protectionist steps were found to have been taken in the first quarter 2009. If the fourth quarter 2012 and the first quarter 2013 repeat this pattern, then the quantum for recent protectionism could easily be revised up into the 200-250 range.¶ With the exception of the occasional trade spat, this resurgence in protectionism has been accomplished quietly. Governments have become adept at tilting the playing field in favour of domestic firms without provoking the ire of trading partners. Figure 2 shows that the larger trading nations – G8 members and the other members of the G20 – account for the lion's share of the 431 protectionist measures implemented during the year from June 2012 to May 2013.¶ The eight Lough Eire summit attendees alone account for 30 per cent of the protectionist measures implemented worldwide in the past year (see the first column of Figure 2). All together, the G20 countries are responsible for 65 per cent of all measures imposed in the past year that harm trading partners. The BRICS account for twice as much recent protectionism than the EU member states, the European Commission, and the United States combined (see the second column of Figure 2).¶ Although trade defence (anti-dumping, anti-subsidy, and import surge) measures were the most commonly used protectionist measures in the past year, together with tariffs (another form of traditional protectionism) they accounted for 174 of the 431 beggar-thy-neighbour policies implemented during June 2012 to May 2013. Governments still resort more often to measures less well-disciplined by WTO rules. Indeed, five years into the crisis governments are still awarding lots of trade-distorting subsidies (see the last column in Figure 2). Migration restrictions saw a big increase in the past year too.

#### Free trade on the decline – prospects for the future are slim

Slaughter 2013 (Mr. Slaughter, professor and associate dean at Dartmouth's Tuck School of Business, served as a member of the president's Council of Economic Advisers from 2005 to 2007, 1-22-13, “Exports Sagging? Try Some Free Trade”, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324235104578243281492639260.html>)

Exports in 2010 and 2011 were boosted mainly by GDP growth among our trade partners. But that growth is fading—and trade liberalization has not been enacted to offset it. Nine of America's top 10 export partners—all but perpetually sluggish Japan—suffered slower GDP growth in 2012 than in 2011. In 2012, U.S. exports to the recessionary 27 European Union countries fell by about 1%. Amid slow economic growth abroad and little movement in the American dollar, the key to spurring U.S. exports is aggressive policy liberalization. Yet how many new U.S. free-trade agreements were negotiated and ratified during President Obama's first term? Zero. How many new agreements look likely to be negotiated and ratified in 2013? Zero. For America to achieve the president's National Export Initiative goal, these zeros must soon be replaced with bold new trade agreements.

#### Free trade on the decline – DOHA deadlocks

Han-Kim 2012 (Young-Han Kim Economics Department, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, South Korea, August, “When does coordination for free trade regimes fail?, <http://www.etsg.org/ETSG2012/Programme/Papers/238.pdf>, SP)

After the launch of the WTO in 1995, efforts to make progress in multilateral trade liberalization have been repeatedly thwarted due to continuous deadlock of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) since negotiations started in 2001. The deadlock in multilateral trade liberalization has been aggravated by the latest advent of the global financial and fiscal crisis and the resulted increased uncertainty in economic fundamentals since the global financial crisis in 2008 and the European fiscal crisis in 2011. The increased uncertainty in economic fundamentals due to the financial and fiscal crisis initiated a vicious circle of protective trade policies and the resulted trade wars within the downgrading economic fundamentals.

### Protectionism decreasing – general

#### Obama re-prioritizing free trade to appease republicans

Strassel 2013 (2-14-13, Kimberley A. Strassel is a member of Wall Street Journal Editorial Board, “The Obama Free-Trade Agenda, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324162304578304533741973160.html>)

Mr. Obama's promise in his Tuesday speech to make free trade a centerpiece of economic revival was one of the few moments that earned him Republican and business-community applause. Trade gurus were heartened by both the attention the president gave the subject, as well as the scope of his ambitions. Mr. Obama vowed to not only finish a long-lingering trade pact with trans-Pacific nations, but to kick off a far-reaching agreement with the European Union. This would be a remarkable turnaround for a White House that has up to now treated trade with thinly disguised disdain. The highlight of its trade agenda are three free-trade pacts—with South Korea, Panama and Colombia—that were signed in the Bush administration, and which the Obama White House took three years to get around to asking Congress to pass. Beyond that, Mr. Obama has shown little appetite for taking on his union and environmentalist base, which oppose free trade on principle.

### WTO credible institution now –general

#### WTO cred has been raked over the coals but there’s still hope

JOHN HEILPRIN [reporting for the Associated Press] ¶ May 8, 2013¶ Incoming WTO director seeks 'negotiating pillar'¶ <http://news.findlaw.com/apnews-lp/dda920e639bb466388513e2423259726>

Brazilian Ambassador Robert Azevedo said Wednesday that his first priority as the new leader of the World Trade Organization will be to try to rescue its credibility as a forum for trade negotiations.¶ Azevedo, in his first appearance as the presumed next WTO director general, said the organization's prestige is on the line because it is used more to settle trade disputes and monitor policy than as a host for serious trade negotiations.¶ "We are at a critical stage. The negotiating pillar of the WTO is completely stuck. There is a clear paralysis in the system," he told a packed room of journalists at Brazil's WTO mission. "We have a trade agenda that we have to broaden and tackle."

#### WTO cred on the brink but not dead

Kanaga Raja [writing for Third World Network- Third World Network (TWN) is an independent non-profit international network of organisations and individuals involved in issues relating to development, developing countries and North-South affairs]¶ TWN Info Service on WTO and Trade Issues-June 19, 2013 Third World Network¶ <http://www.twnside.org.sg/title2/wto.info/2013/twninfo130608.htm>

According to trade officials, delegations who took the floor after Lamy at the informal meeting of the Trade Negotiations Committee (TNC), stressed that importance of the Bali ministerial meeting cannot be underestimated, and failure to achieve something in Bali would very likely lead to a severe loss of credibility to the WTO's negotiating function. A number of developing countries reiterated that an adequate amount of progress is needed in Section II of the draft negotiating text on trade facilitation (on special and differential treatment provisions for developing country and least developed country members), and that more flexibility needs to be seen on this front from the developed countries. They further said that the question of food security is extremely important, and that this had to be part of a Bali package. They also said that development issues must be at the core of any agreement, further stressing the importance of the issues of Duty Free Quota Free (DFQF) market access for LDC products and cotton. South Africa stressed that agriculture must remain a core element of the Bali package, and that development and the LDC pillar is a litmus test for the multilateral trading system. "We cannot return from Bali without any meaningful delivery to the poorest members of this organisation," said South Africa. In his statement at the informal TNC meeting, Lamy, as TNC Chair, said that the purpose of the meeting was to report back to the membership on his recent consultations and contacts and to continue the review of progress on the three Bali potential deliverables of trade facilitation, agriculture and Special and Differential Treatment (S&D)/Least Developed Country (LDC) issues. At the last meeting (in April), said Lamy, "we collectively faced up to the reality that the pace of the substantive engagement to successfully deliver in Bali was wanting. In realisation of the heavy responsibility that confronted us all, not only for Bali, but also for the future of the DDA [Doha Development Agenda] and the WTO's negotiating function, we all committed to a set of prescriptions - changing course; urgently engaging substantively; seeking necessary political will and flexibility from capitals and displaying mutual trust and realism." Since the April meeting, the continuous intensive process in negotiating groups has started to bear some incremental progress, Lamy maintained, but that on the negotiating mode, "we are yet to see the kind of flexibilities that are needed in an endgame negotiation." "We all know that process, however good, is not enough to deliver. It is substantive engagement that holds the key. And here time is turning against us. We are entering the red zone," he warned. Lamy gave his assessment of the state of play on the three areas for Bali deliverables. On agriculture, he said that intensive consultations have continued on the G-33 proposal concerning public stockholding for food security and domestic food aid on the basis of the four questions posed by the Chair (of the agriculture negotiations) to facilitate the search for convergence. According to the TNC Chair, some progress has been made on elements of political convergence which have begun to surface such as willingness to work on declaration/communique language that would recognise in general terms that the policies and programmes mentioned in the first part of the G-33 proposal could fall within the scope of "General Services" of Paragraph 2 of Annex 2 to the Agreement on Agriculture, together with a political message on the role of public stockholding in developing countries. On the amendment or interpretation of existing agriculture disciplines, Lamy said that the views on this issue span a range of different options, none of which is the subject of any consensus at this stage. The main concerns expressed regarding an amendment or interpretation have been: (i) the infeasibility of the "one-solution-fits-all" approach given the differences in the situations the proponents find themselves in, and (ii) the complexity of the issue which many see as only resolvable as part of a much broader agricultural negotiation, which cannot happen in the short time left before Bali. According to Lamy, some Members have indicated an openness to consider a mechanism/process that might provide for some additional flexibility for specific Members on the basis that this would be time-limited, non-automatic, and create no or minimal trade or production distortions. Such flexibility should not be at the expense of economic reforms and transparency - notably through timely notifications - would be an important element in monitoring any flexibility. Some Members also stressed that whatever the temporary solution, it should be an operational one and should not be a substitute for a broader solution. So, said Lamy, "on the key outstanding issues raised by the proposal, we have made progress towards framing the debate appropriately. This is just at conceptual stage and let me stress that obviously none of this is agreed or even accepted as the possible avenue to solve this matter." On this point, what is needed is to explore further a possible landing strip working out the specifics. This will be the focus of the Chair's continuing consultations. On the G-20 proposal on export competition, Lamy said that the preliminary and varying reactions to this proposal indicate that a more in-depth exchange of views to seek to identify the way forward is urgently required and the Chair will be working in this direction. Further to the discussions held over the (G-20) proposal on Tariff Rate Quota (TRQ) administration, "it seems to be in a reasonably good shape." On trade facilitation, Lamy reported that further progress has been made on improving the draft Trade Facilitation agreement through negotiations conducted by the four Friends of the Chair. This allowed Members at the Negotiating Group meeting on 24 May to eliminate a further batch of square brackets from the text. It also produced convergence on other parts of the text that can hopefully be turned into consensus during the new phase of negotiations by the Friends of the Chair that has just begun. "But the progress that is being made is still not enough to provide assurance that we are on track to produce a good result for MC9. What is needed now is more signals of flexibility of the kind displayed at the Senior Officials' meeting in May," said Lamy, adding that the key issue is how to build consensus, especially on those areas which require a higher level of political intervention such as customs co-operation and transit, as well as on other issues such as pre-shipment inspection, customs brokers and consularisation fees. There is also the issue of Section 2, which provides flexibility for developing countries to implement the binding disciplines in Section 1, Lamy pointed out, further saying that these flexibilities are about developing countries scheduling commitments under categories A, B and C, according to their ability to implement them, coupled with technical assistance based on needs assessments. "The key now is to synergise both parts of the agreement so that the flexibilities in Section 2 are used constructively to move the substantive disciplines in Section 1," said Lamy, adding that last week's negotiations showed that the key in this area is not so much whether assistance is available, which it is, but rather finding a way to better link needs with available assistance. "Members need to invest now in making the breakthroughs that we need to see before the end of July. No-one can seriously expect that the many areas of disagreement that still exist in the text can be left until the autumn and can then be sorted out in time for Bali. We need to start removing less conflictual brackets now." In his vew, there are three ways of removing brackets: agreement on substance, agreement to disagree and papering over disagreement with ambiguous or with best endeavour language. "Experience of GATT/WTO negotiations pleads, I believe, broadly, for the first two options." On S&D, the TNC Chair said that in the two meetings held so far on the Monitoring Mechanism and the Cancun agreement-specific proposals, positive advances have been made which could potentially translate into concrete progress in the coming weeks. Further such consultations are planned. "We need to show similar progress in the six Agreement-specific proposals, relating to the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement and the Import Licensing Procedures Agreement to present a credible development package to Ministers in Bali." On LDC issues, Lamy noted that the LDC Group submitted their proposal on an LDC Package for Bali which was circulated to delegations last Friday in document TN/C/W/63. The package that the LDCs are proposing to form part of a Bali outcome includes essentially four areas: implementation of the Hong Kong DFQF (Duty Free Quota Free) Decision; preferential rules of origin; cotton; and operationalisation of the LDC Services Waiver. Lamy said that this was the thrust of the message he had delivered to Ministers last week, both at a small gathering of trade Ministers hosted by the Australian Minister on the margins of the annual OECD Ministerial meeting in Paris and during the bilateral meetings that he held. In Paris, he said he had asked two questions of Ministers: (i) Whether they were all ready to ensure that by the end of July, the contours of landing zones would be in sight; (ii) Whether in particular the so-called "majors" were ready to be more flexible in their positions by moving more to the middle and not simply asking others to move where they were. According to Lamy, the Ministers expressed concern that the negotiations were not on a path that provided confidence of success in Bali. Ministers acknowledged that not making progress in Bali would have damaging implications for the future of the Round and the credibility of the multilateral trading system. Therefore, something significant, substantive and credible had to be done as a building block for work after Bali to pursue the DDA.¶

#### China backing WTO cred now- see it as important to global econ stability

Xinhua Net [Chinese news outlet]¶ Chinese vice premier meets with WTO chief¶ June 28, 2013 <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2013-06/28/c_132496121.htm>

Chinese Vice Premier Wang Yang (R, front) meets with World Trade Organization Director General Pascal Lamy (L, front) in Beijing, capital of China, June 28, 2013. (Xinhua/Li Tao)¶ BEIJING, June 28 (Xinhua) -- Chinese Vice Premier Wang Yang met with Pascal Lamy, director-general of the World Trade Organization (WTO), in Beijing on Friday.¶ Noting uncertainties in global economic recovery, Wang said countries should enhance mutually beneficial cooperation rather than engage in trade protectionism.¶ China supports the WTO in strengthening supervision over trade policy and playing its role in settling trade disputes, said Wang.¶ He said China will continue to promote the Doha Round of WTO negotiations and safeguard the authority and credibility of the multilateral trading system.¶ Earlier on Friday, Wang also met with former U.S. National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft.¶ Wang voiced appreciation of Scowcroft's long-term efforts to promote China-U.S. relations as well as bilateral economic and trade cooperation.¶ The two sides exchanged views on current China-U.S. economic relations.

#### WTO leader to restore credibility – brink is now

Guardian 5-9-13 (“Incoming WTO director to restore credibility,” <http://www.guardian.co.tt/business/2013-05-09/incoming-wto-director-restore-credibility>)

Incoming WTO director to restore credibility GENEVA—The incoming head of the World Trade Organisation says his first priority will be to try to rescue its credibility as a forum for trade negotiations. Brazilian Ambassador Roberto Azevedo told a packed room of reporters at Brazils WTO mission Wednesday that “the negotiating pillar of the WTO is clearly stuck.” At the WTO, diplomats and officials congratulated Azevedo on his selection as WTO director general for the next four years. Azevedo also said it was important to close “the gap” between the WTOs rules and how things really are between trading nations. Azevedo is to take over the organisation on September 1 from Pascal Lamy of France, who has been the director general for eight years.

#### WTO influence now- new director general proves

**Bruske, Global times, 2013**

(Gustavo, “BRICs mask milestone with WTO appointment”, June 6, <http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90778/8273376.html>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

From September, the post now occupied by Pascal Lamy as the Director-General of the World Trade Organization (WTO) will be taken over by a Brazilian, Roberto Carvalho de Azevêdo. This passing of the reins marks another win for the BRICS bloc and offers further evidence that the world's balance of power is shifting towards countries that once held little influence on the global stage. And as these countries become more empowered within important organizations, a sea change is afoot which will create major opportunities for mutual economic benefit.The news mentioned above comes at a time when the world economy is changing rapidly and many European countries have their hands full coping with local and regional economic challenges. As a result, many top positions within prominent world organizations are going toward experts from developing countries. Yet, some are skeptical and say that the WTO is no longer an important organization. However, it is undeniable that BRICS countries will benefit from having a strong influence within an organization composed of 159 members and 25 observing countries. China undoubtedly has great interest in the WTO, having joined the organization in December 2001 after about 15 years of preparation and negotiations. Brazil has been a member since its creation in 1995, just as long as BRICS counterparts India and South Africa - Russia came aboard in 2012. The influence of this group may grow even stronger if Brazil and China can unite their political and economic forces.

### WTO credible institution now – reforms

#### Brink is now - Azcevedo to restore WTO Credibility – experience with reforms

Heilprin 5-9-13 (John Heilprin, AP News Staff Writer, “Azevedo: WTO needs credibility” <http://thenews.mx/index.php/business-articulos/9279-azevedo-wto-needs-credibility>)

GENEVA – Brazilian Ambassador Robert Azevedo said Wednesday that his first priority as the new leader of the World Trade Organization will be to try to rescue its credibility as a forum for trade negotiations. Azevedo, in his first appearance as the presumed next WTO director general, said the organization’s prestige is on the line because it is used more to settle trade disputes and monitor policy than as a host for serious trade negotiations. “We are at a critical stage. The negotiating pillar of the WTO is completely stuck. There is a clear paralysis in the system,” he said at Brazil’s WTO mission. “We have a trade agenda that we have to broaden and tackle.” Back at the WTO, diplomats and officials offered their congratulations to Azevedo, who won consensus support from the organization’s 159 members, most of them nations, to serve at the helm of WTO for the next four years. In a statement, the WTO said Azevedo was selected because of the breadth and consistency of his support among members measured in terms of geographical representation and the spectrum of rich-to-developing nations. He prevailed over Mexican former trade official Herminio Blanco in the final round, from an initial field of nine candidates that also included contenders from Ghana, Costa Rica, Indonesia, New Zealand, Kenya, Jordan and South Korea. His selection is to be made final later this month, after which he will become the first Latin American to head the Geneva-based trade organization since its creation in 1995. Though it can serve as a forum for governments to negotiate trade agreements, the WTO is most often the place where they settle trade disputes according to international trade rules. Increasingly, nations have resorted to negotiating outside the WTO along regional and bilateral lines. But Azevedo drew on his insider status and reputation for brokering deals among parties to make the case that he could best reform the institution.

#### China desires for Trade agreement- benefits WTO

**Wang, 2013**

(Zhile, “TPP can benefit China”, China Daily, June 24, <http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2013-06/24/content_16648874.htm>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

China's enormous success in pushing forward a series of domestic reforms in order to join the World Trade Organization offers valuable experience on how to promote interaction between reforms and opening-up. The country revised a total of 2,300 laws and regulations at the central level and more than 19,000 local ones to facilitate its bid for WTO membership, according to data released by the Ministry of Commerce. On the fifth anniversary of its accession to the WTO in 2006, China had opened more than 100 of its 160 service areas to the outside world in accordance with its WTO membership commitments, an opening-up degree that is tantamount to that fulfilled by some developed countries. In particular, China fully kept its commitments and kept its hands away from the pricing of almost all commodities and services except for the implementation of guidance prices for grains, finished oil and postal services. It is this commitment to giving the market a decisive role in the pricing of goods and services that has helped China to further push forward market reforms and successfully make the transition from a planned economy to a market economy. This transformation has forcibly driven China's economic development and further narrowed the gap with developed countries.Many of the measures taken by China to introduce a market mechanism and deepen reforms over the past decade have been related to its efforts to deal with outside challenges that have resulted from its WTO membership. However, over the past decade its comprehensive national strength and international influence and the competitiveness of its companies have grown to their highest level in history.China's efforts for expanded opening-up since 1992 have helped inject a huge vitality into its economy and the dividends from reform are far from being over. The experiences of China's WTO membership indicate that opening to the outside world can become an important propulsive force for further domestic reforms.Pushing for opening-up in the spirit of reforms and promoting reforms and development through deepening opening-up has been an important experience for China over the past 30-plus years, as Vice-Premier Zhang Gaoli highlighted in March at a high-level Beijing forum on China's development. More efforts are needed than at any other time for China to continue the interaction between reforms and opening up, he added. In March, during his first inspection tour of the Yangtze River Delta after he took office, Premier Li Keqiang said that China still has a lot of room to use opening-up to promote a new round of reforms to release "systematic dividends" and expand domestic demand.

#### On the brink - New leadership in WTO provides opportunity for reforms to restore credibility

Miles 2013 (Tom Miles, Gulf News Staff “WTO Doomed to Failure,” 1-16-13, <http://gulfnews.com/business/opinion/wto-doomed-to-failure-1.1132111>)

“The big question is this: does the WTO retain its centrality in the trading system? It’s down to the next WTO head,” said Simon Evenett, professor of international trade at St Gallen University in Switzerland. Jagdish Bhagwati, professor of economics at Columbia University in New York, compared the WTO system to a three-legged stool, resting on negotiations, rule-making and dispute settlement. With one leg broken, the others start to wobble. “You can’t do away with bilaterals and regionals, but as long as the first leg is not broken, the second and third won’t be,” he said. “The director-general has to come in and say that these things are here to stay, but how do I reconcile all this with the purposes of the WTO system which I am guardian of?” Nine candidates vying to succeed Lamy will make their pitch to the WTO’s membership at the end of this month. Many in the audience have spent a decade toiling over Doha, so none of the hopefuls is likely to trash it or claim to have an easy fix. Instead, Evenett said, they will distance themselves obliquely, with lines like: “It was not our finest hour” or “There’s still some way to go”, while suggesting they could be part of a creative process to try and figure out how to move on. “This is not business as usual,” said Richard Baldwin, professor of international economics at the Graduate Institute of Geneva. “By analogy, the WTO needs a Bernanke or Draghi — a policy leader who can think out of the box and understand how the world has changed and how the policy must change with it — not a Greenspan or Trichet, who were simply implementing the old rules in a faithful, dogmatic style,” he added. But the chances of a revolution are slim. “The way I see it now,” said Baldwin, “the US and China are happy to let the WTO languish — China has nothing to complain about that could be fixed by any conceivable version of Doha, and the US sees no substantial gains from finishing Doha on the current terms.” Both he and Evenett said there was a chance that the WTO would pick a “placeholder” director-general. “If they want a quiet time, you might not want a particularly ambitious WTO head. Someone who just treads water might be acceptable,” said Evenett. That would allow the surge of regional deals to continue unchecked. They would entrench and lubricate corporate supply chains, a bonus to big business, but would do nothing to assuage developing countries wanting a fairer deal on agriculture or better access to rich markets for their exports and services. Bhagwati said the TPP was untransparent and influenced by lobbyists, ensuring that it was full of side conditions, such as stipulations on labour and intellectual property, which made it impossible for developing countries to sign up to. “The lobbyists have to be sidelined,” he said. If the TPP and the “mega-bilaterals” succeed, Baldwin said, global trade will be back to the pre-WTO days, dominated by the “Quad” — the US, EU, Canada and Japan, with negotiations run by and mostly for the Quad members. “This will threaten China, India and Brazil [and others] with exclusion, and at that point, we’ll see the current stalemate destroyed. There will be room for discussions to bring the TPP-like disciplines to the multilateral level.” But the WTO cannot wait for the regional deals to develop to the point they can be harmonised into one whole. Even if that eventually happened — and Baldwin thinks it will require a new body, a WTO 2.0 — Sutherland believes that regional deals are already doing lasting damage to the credibility of the WTO. “Now we are really in danger,” said Bhagwati. “Let’s hope it works out because this is our last chance to save the WTO.”

### WTO credible institution now – specific resolution to cases

**WTO needs resolution and reform to sustain credibility**

**World Trade Organization 12** (“Day 2: Amid global economic problems, WTO reforms urged,” *World Trade Organization*, 9/25/2012, <http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news12_e/pfor_25sep12_e.htm>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Session 25: The WTO: Staying Alive — The Quest for Coherence in Challenging Times

The session revolved around the issue of how to ensure the centrality of the WTO as the forum for multilateral rule-making in the context of the languishing Doha Round. The discussion in particular assessed whether preferential trade agreements (PTAs) and plurilateral agreements were  a hindrance or if  they could be coherently integrated into the multilateral trading system and used as viable mechanisms to keep the WTO alive. Panellists agreed that although the WTO  was more than the Doha Round, the failure to reach agreement would affect the functioning of other WTO pillars, such as the Dispute Settlement Mechanism and trade  monitoring. The panel was also of the opinion that  the rise of PTAs and plurilaterals was inevitable and what was necessary was to minimize their damage. All panellists agreed that substantive challenges existed in the current multilateral trading system and reforms were needed. Some of the commonly identified problems  included: (i) the proliferation of PTAs and the need to maintain coherence with WTO rules; (ii) the inability to update WTO rules in line with 21st century issues, such as climate change and currency valuation; (iii) the need to improve monitoring and implementation of existing WTO agreements; (iv) the continued rise of protectionism; (v) the increased strain on the dispute settlement system from the increase in the number of complex cases.

**Compliance on cases reflects WTO Credibility**

**Agri-Pulse 13** (“Congress says US-China meetings should address trade barriers,” Agri-Pulse, 7/9/2013, <http://www.agri-pulse.com/Congress-says-US-China-meetings-address-trade-barriers-7-9-2013.asp>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Regarding agricultural concerns, the Congressmen said China continues to maintain regulatory barriers to U.S. agriculture exports “that are not supported by science, raising serious questions about whether China is complying with its World Trade Organization (WTO) commitments.” “For example, China’s regulations continue to prohibit the importation of U.S. beef even though the World Organization for Animal Health has recognized that all cuts of U.S. beef derived from cattle of all ages are safe,” the letter states. “In fact, U.S. beef is classified with the same rating as beef from Australia, New Zealand, and other countries that are permitted to export their beef to China.”

### WTO not credible institution now –general

#### WTO Not Credible – twiddling thumbs

Altman 2-4-13 (Daniel Altman teaches economics at New York University's Stern School of Business and is chief economist of Big Think. “Free Trade: You're Doing It Wrong”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/02/04/free_trade_you_re_doing_it_wrong?page=0,1>, SP)

In addition to solving the redistribution problem, the fund would help everyone, winners and losers alike, to understand how trade affected their economic futures. Moreover, it would allow the losers to spend their compensation however they saw fit; some might choose to retrain for a higher-skill job, while others might prefer to take a lower-skill job and buy a new car. Of course, some people might try to weasel out of the winners' category and paint themselves as losers. But the government already does a reasonable job of figuring out who should receive various payments and benefits, from emergency relief to unemployment insurance. Fraud in this case would be even harder -- how do you fake a decades-long career in manufacturing? No, the biggest obstacle for the new mechanism might be getting politicians and the public to trust economists, their statistical models, and a dose of new thinking. Until that happens, the WTO will continue to twiddle its thumbs, and gains from trade will still be left on the table.

### WTO not credible institution now – reforms

#### WTO dispute settlement power is weak- the US doesn’t respect it and WTO can’t force action

Digital Granma International [Latin American news outlet] July 4, 2013¶ Various countries support Cuba’s WTO claim¶ <http://www.granma.cu/ingles/cuba-i/4jul-h-club.html>

A number of countries are supporting Cuba in its reiterated claim against the United States for the theft of the Havana Club trademark and that country’s failure to meet its obligations to the World Trade Organization (WTO).¶ Addressing the WTO Dispute Settlement Panel, Anayansi Rodríguez, the Cuban ambassador in Geneva, noted that Washington has been ignoring the recommendations of the organization for 11 years.¶ In February 2002, the Dispute Settlement Panel ruled that Section 211 of the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998, which protects the theft of the Havana Club trademark, is incompatible with the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, and with the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.¶ Nevertheless, the U.S. government has not made any effort to respect its WTO obligations and thus the Bacardi Company continues fraudulently utilizing the Havana Club label for marketing a rum which is not of Cuban origin, Anayansi Rodríguez noted.¶ "It is not possible to ignore the concerns of Cuba and a significant and growing number of members believe that acts such as this endanger the credibility and effectiveness of the dispute settlement system," she observed.

### WTO not credible institution now – specific resolution to cases

**WTO losing credibility – media decision perceived as theft**

**Clark 13** (Liat, “WTO grants Antigua right to launch 'pirate' site selling US media,” *Wired*, 1/29/2013, <http://www.wired.co.uk/news/archive/2013-01/29/antigua-legitimate-piracy>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The World Trade Organisation has [granted](http://torrentfreak.com/antiguas-legal-pirate-site-authorized-by-the-world-trade-organization-130128/) Antigua and Barbuda the right to sell US media downloads without compensating its makers, after allowing a suspension of US intellectual property rights in the Caribbean country. The ruling, made at a WTO meeting in Geneva, comes five years after the trade body gave Antigua preliminary permission for the suspension, which would allow the country to potentially sell US-made music, TV shows and films to the rest of the world (up to a copyright value of $21 million (£13 million) annually). Speaking to Wired.co.uk Antigua's legal representative Mark Mendel of [Mendel Blumenfeld](http://www.mendel-blumenfeld.com/) said he could not release any details on when we might see a website go live, but that "we are definitely working on it and are hopeful that the US will choose to negotiate fairly and honestly in the very near future so that we do not ultimately have to implement the remedy". The act would not be, as the US is arguing, "theft" or "government-authorised piracy", but a legitimate means for the Caribbean island to make back some of the billions in earnings lost when the US violated a free-trade agreement that forced Antigua to shutdown its online gambling industry -- reportedly putting five percent of the island's 90,000-strong [population](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ac.html) out of work. The US continues to refuse to lift this blockade. "This is probably the most appalling thing to come out of the last couple of days," Mendel told Wired.co.uk, referring to the derogatory accusations made by the US. "For the US to resort to this untrue, unhelpful and irresponsible rhetoric and dissembling when one of the smallest countries in the world has used, to the letter, the processes of the WTO to get a remedy endorsed by international law to enforce a clear and unambiguous violation of international law by the US. I really am shocked by this, and had expected better of the Obama administration. In essence, they are saying that the US will punish or retaliate against a small country for pursuing its legal rights. Really incredible, sad and reminiscent of the worst of colonial thinking. "As we said yesterday, 'when you have nothing, you have nothing to lose', and at this point I believe the Antiguan people and government are at the end of their respective tethers." The saga began when the US did a U-turn on its General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) schedule, which allowed cross-border online gambling. In a limitlessly condescending [statement](http://www.ip-watch.org/weblog/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/US-DSB-statement-Jan28-as-delivered.pdf) to the WTO Dispute Settlement Body, the US reduced its actions -- actions that led to the loss of billions of dollars and the closure of an entire industry -- to nothing more than an unfortunate mishap. "As the United States has explained in the past, the United States never intended gambling and betting services to be included in its schedule under the GATS," it stated, blaming the misunderstanding on "ambiguities in drafting". Its intentions, or lack thereof, are irrelevant. In 2005 the [WTO ruled](http://www.antiguawto.com/WTODispPg.html) that by backtracking on the terms of its GATS schedule, the US had violated free-trade agreements. Under Article 22.3 of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding if a nation has suffered losses because of violation of a WTO agreement, it has the right to seek retribution under a different agreement, if retaliation under the initial agreement "is not practicable or effective".  "Recourse to higher tariffs on goods, or the blocking of goods and services, would not be practicable because the volume of trade is so small that American businesses could easily divert to other markets and in general, to retaliate in goods or services would -- to the extent those goods and services remained available -- only punish Antiguan consumers," explained Mendel. Therefore Antigua sought to cross-retaliate under Article 22 using the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights agreement, which the WTO allowed in 2007. Such a ruling [has been passed before](http://www.wired.co.uk/www-rcf.usc.edu/~enn/text/Ecuador%20revised%2005.doc), but no nation has ever actually acted on. However Antigua appears not to have received any kind of meaningful negotiations with the US (in spite of what the latter argues in its statement) so has decided to go ahead. "The United States is disappointed with Antigua and Barbuda's misplaced decision to abandon constructive settlement discussions and to pursue authorisation to suspend concessions or other obligations," said the US, before delivering a mild threat/dig: "This course will not achieve a positive outcome for the Antiguan economy or people and will make resolution of this longstanding matter more difficult." According to Mendel, the US made no attempts to remedy the situation or offer compensation that might warrant such an arrogant response. "Let me be clear on this -- the US has offered nothing in settlement other than the same terms they have offered to other countries if the US gets to amend the treaty to not cover remote gaming, none of which would be useful to Antigua and none of which were negotiated with Antigua (it was basically a US/EU negotiation). Antigua has presented all of the proposed settlement terms, and rather than being rejected by Antigua, all have been either rejected or ignored by the US. It may be hard for many of your readers to believe, but in this case I can give my assurances that the United States is simply being untruthful." As with other nations which secured cross-retaliation permission from the WTO, Antigua hopes not to have to follow through. The threat could be enough to put Antigua in good stead for further negotiations considering, if it goes through with launching a download portal for international consumption, there's nothing to say other far bigger wronged nations wouldn't be tempted to do the same -- and for a higher cost to the US. The whole affair does however show the US in a poor light, considering such measures had to be taken just to get them to the negotiating table. One related [Wikileak document](http://cablesearch.org/cable/view.php?id=07STATE165472) dated 2007, reportedly from the US Secretary of State's office, appears to prove the focus rested mainly on the EU's position; the US marginalised Antigua, which featured as a mere afterthought: "At a minimum, we are  urging the EU to refrain from joining any arbitration which  Antigua and Barbuda may request," the document reads. "We are not expecting this remedy to be anything other than a means to an end," said Mendel. "Once put in place, it will, however, not even begin to compensate for the job and economic losses from the wrecking of the gaming industry." Mendel says the US has just two options now -- comply, or work out a settlement. It can only take its case to the WTO if Antigua implements the ruling incorrectly. Why then, has the US pursued such a futile course of action, failing to engage in any real negotiations on level-footing with Antigua and resorting to condescending and unproductive rhetoric that does not appear to take the WTO's legitimacy and authority into account? "I do think that the US has a mixed, immature and difficult domestic situation with respect to gambling in general and remote gambling in particular," Mendel told Wired.co.uk. "However, I think the main reason the US has not complied with the WTO rulings is that Antigua is such a small country they think they can get away with it. I also think that, unfortunately, some people in the US government were almost offended that Antigua chose to challenge the US and have been so persistent in its pursuit of justice that the US government has adopted unusually harsh and unyielding lines that have made it difficult to consider our issue in its proper context."

**WTO decisions controversial – economic implications**

**Daemmrich 12** (Arthur A., Harvard Business School; China Europe International Business School (CEIBS), “Varieties of Legitimacy at the World Trade Organization,” 11/16/2012, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2177189>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

For experts drawn into legal and regulatory disputes, a challenge arises concerning specific and general knowledge. The expert is asked to draw conclusions based on their general technical knowledge and experience, rather than from the detailed analysis or direct observation of a specific case. Expert testimony involves two key steps: first, the identification of a fit or misfit between known scientific or economic principles and the case at hand; and second, advancing a narrative and theory to explain various points of misalignment.21 Yet, these activities do not take place in a policy vacuum. For example, in the WTO dispute described here, it became impossible for either the U.S. Department of Agriculture or the Government of Brazil and their hired experts to create new knowledge about the economic and behavioural outcomes produced by agricultural subsidies in a form that was separable from its political and policy implications. As a result, disputes over the correlation of econometric models to the real world mutated into clashes over the basis for expertise. More generally, the use of experts by the WTO poses an organizational dilemma as it seeks legitimacy through democratic and managerial procedures. The WTO’s power increasing lies in classifying, standardizing, and resolving disputes, including deciding on the validity of econometric models. This creates an inherent tension for the WTO going forward, and it may soon encounter epistemic challenges of the sort found regularly at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and at other international organizations.22

### regional trade – trade blocs on the rise now

#### Regional trade blocks are increasing - pragmatism and emerging economies proves

The Economist 2013 (3-16-13, “Can the WTO Save Itself from Irrelevance,” <http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21573549-can-wto-save-itself-irrelevance-other-conclave>)

As multilateral talks fester, regional trade agreements are thriving. This summer America and the European Union will begin official talks on the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), with hopes of completing a deal by end-2014. America is also working on a Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which seeks to deepen ties across many large Pacific-rim economies. Japan is reportedly about to join the talks; China will not be involved. These megadeals are not the only regional talks that are in train (see table). Pragmatism surely explains some of this surge: participants frustrated by stagnant multilateral talks are anxious to do deals where they can. Yet realpolitik cannot be discounted. The TTIP gives America and Europe the chance to establish ground rules for resolving non-tariff trade barriers, which include everything from quotas to export subsidies and licensing schemes, without having to accommodate the likes of China. Rules adopted between them on emerging trade issues, related to service industries and online commerce, could become an international standard, free of meddling from emerging economies.

#### Regional Trade blocs on the rise

**Ochieng and Mgidu, 2013**

(Ben and Chris, “East African regional integration on course- says Nairobi”, July 5, <http://www.coastweek.com/3627_37.htm>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Kenya said the integration of the East African Community is on course and will be further deepened by the signing of the Monetary Union Protocol in November.The EAC Council of Ministers’ meeting scheduled for August will pave way for the signing of the Protocol by the EAC Heads of States three months later, said Phyllis Kandie, Kenya’s Cabinet Secretary for East African Affairs, in Nairobi on Monday during celebrations to mark the third anniversary of the EAC Market Protocol. “Partner states are now in the process of harmonizing their national laws, especially in areas of trade, to accommodate the provisions of the Common Market Protocol so that laws do not conflict with regional trade agreements,” the Cabinet Secretary said. “We are however confident that the East African Community will move at a steady pace towards the third pillar of integration, that is the Monetary Union, now that the Common Market dream is a reality.” Trade analysts at the forum urged the East African region to ratchet up intra-Africa trade, saying regional trade remains Africa’s biggest opportunity for rapid economic development. Intra-regional trade has been on a steady rise, with a recent report showing that Kenya has eclipsed global Asian powerhouses in investing in the East African region. Due to growing business prospects, East Africa is now a top destination for the business fraternity angling for a portion of the East African pie due to the improved business environment and discovery of commercially viable oil and gas deposits in Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania.

#### Regional Trade Agreements happening now- Central America and Mexico prove

**Reyes, 2013**

(L, “Regional free trade agreement with Mexico enters into force”, July 1, <http://www.ticotimes.net/More-news/News-Briefs/Regional-free-trade-agreement-with-Mexico-enters-into-force_Monday-July-01-2013>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

A free trade agreement between Central America and Mexico entered into force this week, the Costa Rican Foreign Trade Ministry (COMEX) reported on Monday.For Costa Rica, the treaty is an update of an agreement the two countries signed in 1994.Foreign Trade Minister Anabel González said the deal will allow increased trade with, and investment from, Mexico.In order to take advantage of the treaty's benefits, exporters must fill out a certificate that will be made available at COMEX's website in coming days. Businesses with certificates from the previous treaty are entitled to use them for a period of 45 days. Mexico is the third most important destination for Costa Rican products, behind the United States and Spain. However, Costa Rica has a negative trade balance with Mexico. According to Costa Rica's Foreign Trade Promotion Office, exports to Mexico in 2012 totaled $322 million, while imports totaled $1.1 billion. Costa Rica exports to Mexico mostly palm oils, prepared food and rubber products, among others.

### regional trade trade blocs on the decline now

#### Regional blocs on the decline- global trade on the rise

EY News 5-30-2013 (Press release Increase in global trade in rapid growth markets boosts economy but creates tax complexity London, 30 May 2013, <http://www.ey.com/GL/en/Newsroom/News-releases/News_Increase-in-global-trade-in-rapid-growth-markets-boosts-economy-but-creates-tax-complexity>)

Increase in global trade in rapid growth markets boosts economy but creates tax complexity The need for effective management of indirect taxes in rapid growth markets (RGMs) to avoid unnecessary costs and risks and maximize opportunities is the primary concern for many multinationals, according to a new EY report, Managing indirect tax in rapid growth markets. Grants and incentives encourage investment but may come at a price RGMs not immune to the increased focus on enforcement As the first wave of emerging economies such as Brazil, Russia, India and China mature, new RGMs are emerging such as Colombia, Indonesia, Peru, Turkey and Vietnam – resulting in a change in pattern to trade and investment. This has lead to a marked increase in global transactions with RGMs which, while boosting the economy, creates significant tax implications. Philip Robinson, Global Indirect Tax Leader at EY comments: “For many multinationals, the task of keeping up with obligations for VAT/GST, customs duties, export controls and grants and incentives in every country where they operate can represent a heavy burden which is exacerbated by the lack of harmonization between countries’ requirements, a lack of qualified resources in some regions and the use of multiple accounting systems. “As a result, many companies are beginning to look more critically at how they manage indirect taxes in RGMs, adopting and adapting management structures and processes from other region.” Local compliance in a global world Multinationals are finding that indirect tax costs, formal rules, restrictive regulations and bureaucracy can be a barrier to international trade but opportunities exist to improve business outcomes, speed up deliveries and reduce costs. Effective controls, robust processes, standardized procedures and the use of appropriate technology can all help to improve accuracy and reduce risks. In addition, collaborating across functions and geographies, and building relationships with trusted third parties and tax administrations makes the most effective use of scare resources – and helps to avoid costly and protracted disputes.

### NAFTA credible/effective now

#### Prospects are hopeful for NAFTA

**Manzella 1992**

(John, Editor-in-Chief at The ManzellaReport.com, “Waking A Sleeping Giant—The Dawn of NAFTA,” The Manzella Report, 10-31-92, 7-10-13 http://www.manzellareport.com/index.php/trade-finance/455-waking-a-sleeping-giantthe-dawn-of-nafta)//KC

Under a North American Free Trade Agreement, investment access and property protection is expected to become more enticing. Thus, NAFTA legislation is anticipated to have a considerable impact on manufacturing in Mexico. The prospect of a North American Free Trade Agreement has given Mexico greater international credibility and abated investment fears. A NAFTA would offer Mexico secure access to U.S. and Canadian markets at a time when global protectionism is on the rise. This is extremely important Asian and European firms. Additionally, a NAFTA would somewhat tie the hands of future Mexican presidents preventing a political or economic policy turnaround. Thus, greater Mexican stability is key to American long-term planning and investing.

#### NAFTA effective now - ICT and regional growth proves

**Wilson 2013**

(Timothy, herrell J. Aston Professor of Psychology at the University of Virginia, “Twenty Years Later: Accounting for NAFTA’s Wins and Losses,”Nearshore Americas, 3-25-13, 7-10-13, http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/nafta-mexicos-tech-spending-spree/)//KC

The North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between Mexico, the United States and Canada, just entered its 20th year. In that time investments in information and computing technology (ICT) have certainly increased in Mexico – as they have everywhere in the world. Tracking specific investments to NAFTA is more art than science, though it is true that the shift from being a distribution economy, in which global ICT firms simply set up franchise shops, to one where real investment and development takes place, can likely be attributed to the trade deal. For example, according to research firm MarketLine, Mexico enjoyed the fastest growing rate of software investment among the three NAFTA countries, with a CAGR of 3 percent over the 2007-11 time period. Mexican software revenues were not insignificant, at $2.7 billion, in 2011. And on the mobile phone front, Mexico was also the fastest growing in the NAFTA bloc, with a cumulative growth rate of 11.5 percent over the 2007-11 period. When NAFTA was implemented in January 1994 almost 70 percent of U.S. imports from Mexico, and 50 percent of U.S. exports, suddenly became duty free. Then, over the next 15 years, all remaining duties were eliminated. There were also provisions for service sector market access, as well as for both the protection of U.S. foreign direct investment, and the intellectual property rights of U.S. companies. With NAFTA then providing a secure legal framework, global ICT players felt more comfortable setting up shop in Mexico, and investment followed. It is in this context that analysts are more comfortable making predictions. MarketLine, for example, is looking out to 2016, saying that Mexico will then have $3.3 billion in software spending. But the trade deal is by no means the answer to all of Mexico’s problems. Despite the fact that there appear to have been significant macro-economic benefits, including increased technology investment, NAFTA certainly hasn’t been a magic wand – particularly with regard to rural poverty and income disparity in Mexico. “A number of studies have found that NAFTA has brought economic and social benefits to the Mexican economy as a whole,” wrote M. Angeles Villarreal, specialist in International Trade and Finance, in a 2010 report to the United States Congress, “but the benefits have not been evenly distributed throughout the country.” In fact, in Villarreal’s opinion “the effects on the Mexican economy tended to be modest at most.” Of course, not everyone is in agreement. One booster is Stephen Zamora, director of the Center for U.S. and Mexican Law. Speaking to the Metropolitan Corporate Council, a law journal, Zamora contended recently that NAFTA has had a net positive effect on all three participating countries. “While unskilled U.S. workers in certain industries experienced a negative impact, many U.S. companies profited from being able to maximize operations and enjoy cost efficiencies by strategically placing parts of their business in each country,” he said. For many that might not sound like a benefit, but Zamora says that NAFTA has created a degree of economic integration with the United States that has helped keep higher value jobs at home – with home meaning the North American continent. “The increasingly integrated economies of the NAFTA countries helps keep jobs in North America that might otherwise have migrated to Asia or other regions.”

### NAFTA not effective now

#### NAFTA not perceived as useful anymore- TPP proves better

**Canning, 2013**

(Ernest, “Rep. Grayson Warns about Details of Classified ‘Trans-Pacific Partnership’ Agreement”, July 1, <http://www.bradblog.com/?p=10081>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

"The TPP is nicknamed 'NAFTA on steroids.'", Rep. Alan Grayson (D-FL) wrote in a recent email to supporters, explaining what he saw after being allowed to review some of the text of the new, extremely broad, and very classified trade agreement being hammered out behind close doors. "Now that I've read it, I can see why," he added. His email suggests just how far down the secrecy rabbit hole our nation has traveled, not just in our massive classified surveillance state, parts of which are presently being revealed by former NSA contractor turned whistleblower Edward Snowden, but even in our so-called "free trade agreements" being negotiated, supposedly, on our behalf. As Grayson warned after reviewing part of the new agreement last month: "There is no national security purpose in keeping this text secret...This agreement hands the sovereignty of our country over to corporate interests"...

#### TTP quickly being pushed through Congress

(Ernest, “Rep. Grayson Warns about Details of Classified ‘Trans-Pacific Partnership’ Agreement”, July 1, <http://www.bradblog.com/?p=10081>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

Last month, in ["Please Don't Notice the Global Corporate Coup"](http://www.bradblog.com/?p=10028), we discussed how the Obama Administration has quietly sought "[fast track authority](http://www.cepr.org/pubs/new-dps/dplist.asp?dpno=6790)" to secretly negotiate and ram through Congress the [Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)](http://www.salon.com/2012/10/23/everything_you_wanted_to_know_about_the_trans_pacific_partnership/) --- a NAFTA-like "free trade" agreement that not only [reportedly threatens](http://economyincrisis.org/content/the-trans-pacific-partnership-would-destroy-our-national-sovereignty) our national sovereignty, but aspires to supplant the sovereignty of all participating nation-states with a privately-controlled, all encompassing, global corporate "investor state," according to leaked pieces of the agreement. The "investor state", in this case, references the treaty's creation of arbitration tribunals which are granted the power to negate the effectiveness of laws passed by the individual nation-states that are parties to the treaty. Under the guise of so-called "free trade agreements," multinational corporations are allowed to by-pass the legislative process and democratic accountability in the nations that sign onto the TPP. The result, as we explained in our detailed coverage last month, is the undermining of Internet freedom, environmental laws and regulations, and local laws protecting the health and safety of the citizenry of all nations who participate in the trade agreement.

### FTAA credible/effective now

#### US Supports the FTAA – strong pushes

**Grevi and Keohane 13** (Giovanni and Daniel, “Challenges for European Foreign Policy in 2013 Renewing the EU’s role in the world,” *FRIDE*, <http://www.fride.org/download/Challenges_for_European_Foreign_Policy_2013.pdf>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Based on those principles and achievements, the EU has been a significant player in Latin America, providing an alternative to US influence in the region. Until the end of the 1990s, the US and the EU had been Latin America’s most important external partners, pursuing parallel strategies of engagement. Both were committed to different projects: the US pushed for the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA); the EU bet strongly on the Southern Common Market (Mercosur), whose initial objectives followed the European model. In 1995, the US accounted for 60 per cent of Latin America’s commercial flows, and the EU represented 25 per cent. Both Washington and Brussels began organising summits with a region that featured prominently on their international agendas.

### FTAA not effective now

#### FTAA politically unpopular

**Jasper 13** (William F., “Secretly Trading Away Our Independence,” The New American, 5/9/2013, <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/foreign-policy/item/15296-secretly-trading-away-our-independence>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Because the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership is an agreement with an already existing transnational superstate — the EU — and because most of the key TTIP promoters have already enthusiastically embraced the EU ideas of integration, harmonization, and convergence, it is probably the more dangerous of the two agreements, although the Trans-Pacific Partnership may be coming up earlier for a vote in the U.S. Congress.  Obama Turns to “Trade”  Compared to his two immediate predecessors, who both used brutal “ground and pound” methods to force trade pacts through Congress, Obama may seem to have been somewhat negligent of trade issues. The Clinton administration negotiated more than 200 bilateral and multilateral trade agreements, including a major one with Communist China, as well as pushing the hugely controversial North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) through Congress and winning approval for the equally contentious issue of U.S. membership in the World Trade Organization. The George W. Bush administration, most notably, won approval for a Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) but failed to win passage of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) to create an EU-style project for the Western Hemisphere. He also failed to enact the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP), a pact to develop an EU-type process among Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

#### FTAA in deadlock – ineffective

**Grevi and Keohane 13** (Giovanni and Daniel, “Challenges for European Foreign Policy in 2013 Renewing the EU’s role in the world,” FRIDE, <http://www.fride.org/download/Challenges_for_European_Foreign_Policy_2013.pdf>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

This has all since changed. Now the US represents 40 per cent of Latin American trade and the EU accounts for only 14 per cent (the same as Asia); summits have lost traction; and big projects such as the FTAA or the EU-Mercosur partnership agreement have either evaporated or are in deadlock. The EU is still Latin America’s main external investor and donor – particularly Spain (the second) and Germany (the third) –, but the economic crisis will further diminish these flows.

#### FTAA not credible now

**Sanneh 13** (Kelefa, joined The New Yorker as a staff writer in 2008. Prior to that, he was the pop-music critic for the New York Times, beginning in 2002. Before covering music for the Times, he was the deputy editor of Transition, a journal of race and culture, based at the W. E. B. Du Bois Institute for African and African American Research, at Harvard University. His writing has also appeared in The Source, Rolling Stone, Blender, the Village Voice, Man’s World (“India’s classiest men’s magazine”), “Da Capo Best Music Writing” in [2002](http://www.amazon.com/Capo-Best-Music-Writing-2002/dp/0306811669/), [2005](http://www.amazon.com/Capo-Best-Music-Writing-2005/dp/0306814463/), and [2007](http://www.amazon.com/Best-Music-Writing-2007-Capo/dp/0306815613), and newspapers around the world, “PAINT BOMBS David Graeber’s “The Democracy Project” and the anarchist revival.,” *The New Yorker*, 5/13/2013, <http://www.newyorker.com/arts/critics/atlarge/2013/05/13/130513crat_atlarge_sanneh?currentPage=all>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

In a deeply indignant response to Hedges, Graeber pointed out that black-bloc actions had been rare in the Occupy movement. Much of Hedges’s concern seemed to arise from a single incident in Oakland, when a black bloc smashed bank windows and vandalized a Whole Foods. Like many anarchists, Graeber doesn’t think property damage is violence. And he believes that so-called “mobs” have their uses—in 2001, in Quebec City, he was part of a black bloc that succeeded in toppling a chain-link fence meant to separate activists from the free-trade meeting they wanted to disrupt. He supports “diversity of tactics,” an approach that urges different kinds of activists to stay physically separate (so as not to endanger each other) but politically united. Above all, Graeber rejects what he calls “the peace police”: activists who try to control other activists’ behavior, sometimes in collaboration with the real police. His tolerance for confrontational protest stems in part from his disinclination to empower anyone to stop it. Graeber is more worried about the charge that modern anarchists are feckless, so he is keen to give anarchists credit for changing the world. He claims that the Global Justice movement weakened the W.T.O. and scuttled the Free Trade Area of the Americas pact, which was the topic of those discussions in Quebec City. And he credits the Occupy movement with preventing Mitt Romney from becoming President. (He underestimates Romney’s own, invaluable contributions to this cause.) Graeber is pleased, too, to underscore the links between Occupy and other popular movements around the world, from the Egyptian uprising to the ongoing demonstrations of the Indignados, in Spain. He sees a global “insurrectionary wave,” united less by a shared ideology than by a shared opposition to an increasingly global social arrangement.

#### FTAA ineffective now

**Bruce 12** (Iain, a Latin American correspondent for International Viewpoint. He is a journalist and film-maker and author of “The Porto Alegre Alternative: Direct Democracy in Action” (IIRE - International Institute for Research and Education), “After Venezuela’s elections: defeat for the right, challenges for the left,” International Viewpoint, 12/10/2012, <http://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article2791>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The 2009 coup in Honduras looked like it might herald a new offensive from the United States and the right across the region. It was followed by the revelation of Washington’s plans for new military bases in Colombia and the election of right-wing presidents in Chile, Panama, Costa Rica. But the offensive faltered. There were divisions among the competing, middle-level cliques that now ran Washington’s Latin American policy. Most of the region’s increasingly autonomous bourgeois governments reacted with hostility. The Obama administration was left looking more diplomatically isolated than ever. At the same time, Washington’s right-wing allies in the region have faced mounting social resistance. The huge movement led by students in Chile is the most important, but the recent revolt in Colon, Panama, forcing President Ricardo Martinelli to withdraw plans to privatise land in the continent’s largest free-trade zone, is emblematic of a wider mood. Even in Mexico and Colombia, right-wing hegemony has been dented, with the thrashing of the PAN in the former and President Santos’ shift to the centre in the latter. The peace talks now underway in Cuba with Colombia’s FARC guerrillas may signal a defeat for one kind of Latin American left. But they could open the lid on some of the region’s most potent social struggles. In this context, last June’s parliamentary coup in Paraguay looks more like a wounded beast lashing out than the continuation of a concerted strategy. The reason for this relative failure of the right is clear. Latin America is still the part of the world where the challenge to neoliberal hegemony – that is imperialism – has gone furthest. This remains true even after the extraordinary mobilizations in the Arab world and Europe since 2011. Venezuela’s Bolivarian revolution has been the key component here: first, because it showed, in practice, that a break with neoliberal priorities was possible; second, because for the first time since the collapse of the soviet block it opened up a discussion about socialism as the framework for any alternative, under the heading “socialism of the 21st century”. In this context, there is no doubt that Chavez’ victory is a victory for all of us on the left, and an important one.

### CAFTA credible/effective now

**CAFTA is valued over 45 billion annually – effective**

**George 10** (Tarun, “[Five Years Later, CAFTA Influence on Pro Services Outsourcing is Hotly Debated](http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/five-years-later-what-has-cafta-dr-really-done-for-professional-services-outsourcing/),” *Nearshore Americas*, 2/16/2010, <http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/five-years-later-what-has-cafta-dr-really-done-for-professional-services-outsourcing/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The Dominican Republic-Central American Free trade Agreement (DR-CAFTA) remains a controversial treaty five years after its contentious passage, yet many experts believe that the agreement is only just beginning to show its real impact. CAFTA-DR forms one of the largest free trade blocs in the Americas, joining together Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic. Bilateral trade between the US and the CAFTA countries is valued at over $45 billion annually. But nearly five years on from when it was first implemented in the US, what effect has it had on the trade in services? [NearshoreAmericas](http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/) is taking a look at whether CAFTA has in fact enabled a more productive relationship between US customers and the professional services outsourcing industry in Central America.

### CAFTA not effective now

**Not effective – Exports Jobs**

**Hoffa 13** (James P., “Congress must vet the Pacific Rim trade proposal,” *The Detroit News*, 7/10/2013, <http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20130710/OPINION01/307100001>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Workers across Michigan and the U.S. are working harder today for less pay than they received just a few years ago. Jobs that once allowed wage earners to support their families disappeared during the last recession, replaced by jobs that pay poverty wages. But more importantly, millions of good jobs have been exported over the past 20 years because of bad trade deals such as NAFTA, CAFTA and PNTR. It’s no accident that the average American family’s income has fallen over that period as politicians of both parties signed “free trade” deals that trade American jobs and safety standards for bigger corporate profits.

**Not effective – Export Jobs**

**Torry 13** (Jack, chief of the Dispatch Washington bureau, “Jack Torry commentary: Brown hasn't wavered in his position on free-trade deals,” *The Columbus Dispatch*, 6/17/2013, <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/editorials/2013/06/17/brown-hasnt-wavered-in-his-position-on-free-trade-deals.html>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

By contrast, Sherrod Brown has remained consistent. He has opposed virtually every free-trade agreement sent to Congress. “The American people know that after NAFTA, CAFTA and permanent China trade relations were passed, plants were closed and we lost 5 million good-paying manufacturing jobs” across the country, he said.

### MERCOSUR credible/effective now

#### MERCOSUR effective now- Venezuela proves

**Leon, 2013**

(Mariela, “Time, resources needed to tackle Venezuela’s deficit with Mercosur”, El Universal, June 24, <http://www.eluniversal.com/economia/130624/time-resources-needed-to-tackle-venezuelas-deficit-with-mercosur>, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

The Venezuelan government and entrepreneurs from different sectors gathered earlier in June in an attempt to boost domestic production and place surplus production in foreign markets, including the Member States of the Common Market of the South (Mercosur), as a means to comply with the regulations and terms of the trade integration bloc.Although Venezuela joined Mercosur as a full member only in July 2012, "trade has been effective since 2002 through Economic Complementation Agreement 59. Since then, tariffs have been cut by 65%," said Venezuelan Central University Professor Eduardo Porcarelli.Today, Venezuela faces different degrees of trade imbalance with Mercosur members. Reversing this situation takes willingness, time, and resources, the expert noted.Porcarelli highlighted that strengthening the production apparatus and exports cannot be done overnight. It is important to identify obstacles and correct them.

#### MERCOSUR effective- popularity with Ecuador and Bolivia proves

**Alvarado, 2013**

(Mercedes, “Ecuador Asks To Start Negotiations To Become Mercosur Member”, The Washington Post, June 20, <http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20130620-710079.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>, accessed on7/5/13, BT)

Ecuador has made a formal request to start negotiations that will make it a full member of the Mercosur group, Foreign Trade Minister Francisco Rivadeneira said. "We have requested a start to the process of negotiations," Mr. Rivadeneira was quoting as saying by the state-owned Andes news agency."We are thinking of entering as a full member," he said.Members of Mercosur are Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela. Last December, Bolivia signed an agreement to become a full member of the bloc. In 2012, the group temporally suspended the participation of Paraguay amid disagreement over that nation's impeachment of former President Fernando Lugo. Mr. Rivadeneira also said a government commission will travel to Brussels next month to resume talks with the European Union about signing a trade agreement with the group. Mr. Rivadeneira was sworn on Wednesday as head of the new Ministry of Foreign Trade. The new ministry was created as a tool of economic policy to boost international trade relations and to coordinate activities for the government policy of imports substitution. "With an agency exclusively dedicated to foreign trade, we can look forward to a more active tariff and para-tarriff policy. The control on imports will be more effective and import requirements will be more complicated and restrictive," said the private consulting firm Group Spurrier in its last report.

### MERCOSUR not effective now

#### MERCOSUR failing- inequitable trade

**Bullard 2013**

(Kimberly, Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “Mercosur's Struggles as an Economic Block,” The Council on Hemispheric Affairs, 3-8-13, ProQuest, 7-9-13, <http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2055/docview/1354349675/13F2779E6D95C4A9DEE/75?accountid=7113)//KC>

Mercosur's territory covers almost 60 percent of Latin America's landmass, but the individual countries are not equal. In fact, among member states, there is significant variation in terms of infrastructure and economic growth. According to the 2011 World Bank statistics, 48 percent of Argentina's GDP results from its exports to the intra-block market, as compared to 49 and 27 percent in Paraguay and Uruguay, respectively. Brazil is the least reliant on intra-regional trade, with only 12 percent of its GDP effected by exports to Mercosur members; and, in 2009, its exports to the European Union generated 26 percent. The GDPs also vary greatly, from $2.47 trillion USD in Brazil to $46.7 billion USD in Paraguay. Similarly, Uruguay and Paraguay cannot compete at the global level, since developed countries (the U.S. and the E.U.) view them as highly volatile markets and unsafe investments. Consequently, foreign direct investment (FDI) has slowly increased in Brazil, while simultaneously declining in Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay, the foreign policies of which have become closely linked to the regional trade block. This contributes to disparities in exchange rates, which freeze out competition among members. Beginning in 1999, Mercosur's progress has been severely hindered by political and economic crises in Argentina, with tremendous repercussions in Uruguay and Paraguay, and structural weaknesses in Brazil.

#### MERCOSUR hindered by political and economic structure of participating countries

**Bullard 2013**

(Kimberly, Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “Mercosur's Struggles as an Economic Block,” The Council on Hemispheric Affairs, 3-8-13, ProQuest, 7-9-13, <http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2055/docview/1354349675/13F2779E6D95C4A9DEE/75?accountid=7113)//KC>

The underlying problem of Mercosur is the internal political strife within each member state. It is impossible to develop a supranational organization while there are domestic institutional problems. Many countries are saddled with corrupt and inefficient commercial and public services. Most governments have yet to provide a good governance model, so that their institutions are not overrun by political manipulation, slow adjudication process, corruption, and public mistrust. Additionally, governments lack the will or ability to ensure citizens' rights or question repressive policies, and, as long as political violence remains high, there will be low levels of political accountability. Is there a future for Mercosur? Even though Mercosur members have tried to portray themselves as positive, domestic instability hurts any regional block. Since 2006, Argentina pushed unsuccessfully for the Chavez membership. Paraguay, however, the only non center-left government, voted no. The controversial admission of Venezuela in 2012 was a purely political move and only possible because of Paraguay's suspension. Although Mercosur was created for economic integration, today it has come to serve as an entirely ideological block, leaving its smaller members (Uruguay and Paraguay) begging for their rights as stated in the 1991 charter. Unfortunately, the block's advantages have limitations when used as a foreign policy tool to strengthen smaller member states' global negotiating power.

# Free Trade Good - Links

### Free Trade = Protectionist

#### It’s just protectionism in free trade’s clothing- selectively lowering trade barriers is still protectionist market manipulation

Evan Soltas [a contributor to the Ticker—associate of Bloomberg News]¶ June 17, 2013¶ Are Free-Trade Agreements Actually Protectionist?¶ <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-17/are-free-trade-agreements-actually-protectionist-.html>

Are free-trade agreements protectionist? It sounds like a silly question, but it's always worth asking of regional (as opposed to global) trade pacts -- like the ones the U.S. is seriously considering with the European Union and the Pacific Rim.¶ Economists are often mocked for free-trade worship, but they're skeptical when appropriate. Jacob Viner, a University of Chicago economist, [argued](http://books.google.com/books?id=ime-GT2Whh8C&lpg=PA105&ots=iVV-uVZ7DV&dq=JACOB%20VINER%201950%20The%20Customs%20Union%20Issue&lr&pg=PA105#v=onepage&q&f=false) in 1950 that free-trade agreements don’t necessarily promote free trade.¶ Trade deals have two effects, he said: They create trade by lowering the cost of international exchange, but they also divert it by the selective reduction of barriers. Whether the first or the second effect predominates determines whether the deal is good or bad.¶ To see this more clearly, imagine three countries, Viner wrote, and call them A, B and C. Country A can import a good from B and C. At the beginning, A has the same import tariffs against both. B produces the good less efficiently than C, so A buys the good from C. Then A and B make a trade agreement, but they leave out C. The reduction in tariffs leads A to buy the good from B, the less efficient producer. Now the world is worse off and trade more distorted.¶ The example might become real life if "C" stands for China and the trade deal is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, an agreement that hopes to reduce trade barriers between the U.S. and Pacific-Rim nations such as Japan, Vietnam and Peru. Financial Times columnist David Pilling has [called](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/08cf74f6-c216-11e2-8992-00144feab7de.html#axzz2VMvOvCXH) it the "'anyone but China' club."¶ If that's what TPP is, it's a mistake. The U.S. is inviting economic trouble -- not to mention other kinds of trouble -- if it adopts this approach. Paul Krugman put it well in a 1991 [article](http://www.kansascityfed.org/PUBLICAT/EconRev/EconRevArchive/1991/4q91.pdf#page=7): "Half a loaf may be worse than none." It's an opinion he shares with another prominent trade economist, Columbia's Jagdish Bhagwati, who called such tactical deals "termites in the trading system" in a [book](http://www.amazon.com/Termites-Trading-System-Preferential-Agreements/dp/B008SLJRPM) in 2008.

#### “Free trade” isn’t free or about trade- it’s a ploy to protect markets and investments from stockholders. The whole concept is free trade in disguise

[Stan Sorscher](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stan-sorscher) [Labor Representative, Society for Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace]¶ "Free Trade" Was Never Really About Trade¶ June 17, 2013 ¶ <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stan-sorscher/free-trade-was-never-real_b_3427477.html>

We need to think differently about trade.¶ First, let me say that I am 100% in favor of trade. Trade is when we do what we do best, they do what they do best, and we trade. Trade, [done right,](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stan-sorscher/environmentalists-trade_b_2697388.html" \t "_hplink) will raise living standards.¶ If trade is good, then free trade must be better, right? So consider this old joke about "free trade."¶ ¶ It's not free.¶ ¶ It's not trade.¶ Twenty years after NAFTA we can add that it doesn't work. It's bad for millions of workers, families and communities around the world.¶ "Free trade" is not free. Our free trade policy encourages production to leave the country. We've lost millions of manufacturing jobs. More than [60,000 manufacturing plants were closed](http://www.citizen.org/documents/manufacturing-job-loss.pdf" \t "_hplink) between 2000 and 2010 as production moved overseas. These costs are real.¶ "Free trade" is not trade. Basically, trade is when each country makes things of value for export and gets things of comparable value in imports. In modern globalization, other countries manipulate their currencies, use tax strategies that distort exports and imports, and apply effective well-designed industrial policies to build manufacturing capacity. They export more products to us, and import fewer products from us.¶ Our trade deficits since NAFTA are over $8 trillion. With trade deficits this large, we are not trading. We are letting other countries produce for us. We borrow, de-industrialize, and ultimately fail to capitalize on future production opportunities. That's not trade. That's getting picked clean.¶ Additionally, language in trade agreements is not about "trade," so much as protecting investors. The most charitable explanation I've heard for this is [global businesses need strong "rule of law"](http://www.worldpolicy.org/sites/default/files/uploaded/image/WSJ-1993-No%20Rule%20of%20Law,%20No%20Free%20Trade.pdf" \t "_hplink) in countries with weak legal systems. They can't risk investing in Mexico, Peru or Jordan if their property could be taken from them. Patents and intellectual property must be protected from modern global piracy of one form or another. OK. Sure. Investors need rights.¶ In America, [we solved the problem of protecting investor rights](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stan-sorscher/trade-investor-rights_b_2195433.html" \t "_hplink). We created rules for commerce among the 50 states. We innovated and helped investors prosper, AND we protected clean water and clean air AND we made social investments in schools, roads, power, arts and sciences, AND we set labor standards so workers could share in gains from productivity. Well, until recently, arguably.¶ The European Union also solved that problem, protecting investor rights among their 17 or 22 or 27 countries or whatever that number is, AND they invest in research and development AND educate their children AND promote sustainable energy AND share the gains from productivity with workers. Well until recently, arguably.¶ Modern democracies built policy solutions over generations of political engagement. We achieved an upward spiral, raising living standards for the most part.¶ However, free trade agreements pursue a very different political process, driven by global companies, and aimed primarily at investor interests.¶ Free trade agreements are bad for millions of people because they are not really about trade. More importantly, they limit the political process so investors are relieved of responsibility for protecting the environment OR recognizing labor rights or human rights, OR dealing with public health OR worrying about prudent financial regulation.¶ The overall result is downward pressure that weakens our political and social values, eroding civil society and public interest in all countries. [My Congressman made a compelling argument](http://www.rollcall.com/news/worlds_apart_making_sure_trade_policies_improve_global_health_commentary-225237-1.html" \t "_hplink) for public interest, based on his personal experience as a doctor in Africa. Global pharmaceutical companies use patents to charge prices far above market levels. We expect a public good in return. This goes horribly wrong when millions of people with treatable diseases are denied access to life-saving medicine because trade agreements favor investors over people. This is exactly the kind of question we want elected officials to resolve. That's why we have democracies.¶ Instead, under "free trade" agreements, a trade tribunal will make those policy decisions for us and for millions of vulnerable people around the world. These shadowy tribunals will enforce rules written into "free trade" agreements, which are all about investor rights, not about trade and not about public interests.¶ Show me language in free trade deals that protects the environment. Show me language for worker standards. Show me free trade provisions for human rights, public health.¶ Here's an easy one - show me any action to stop currency manipulation, which distorts trade, subsidizes global companies who produce offshore, and makes a mockery of any textbook principles of legitimate trade.¶ We are negotiating two giant new "free trade" agreements, which are not about trade. They are about global governance. One is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP. So far, 11 Pacific-rim countries will be included. The other huge deal is for Europe.¶ The defining characteristic of these agreements is that investor rights will have priority over public interest. [They weaken Democracy](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stan-sorscher/china-labor-rights_b_1742528.html" \t "_hplink). They are not really about trade.¶ If the TPP and the European deal are signed, we will have locked in this new 21st century colonialism for generations to come.¶ It was never really about trade.

#### Free Trade Agreements contain protectionist policies- TPP proves

**Pilling, 2013**

(David, “It won’t be easy to build an ‘anyone but China’ club”, Financial Times, May 22, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/08cf74f6-c216-11e2-8992-00144feab7de,Authorised=false.html?_i_location=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ft.com%2Fcms%2Fs%2F0%2F08cf74f6-c216-11e2-8992-00144feab7de.html&_i_referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bloomberg.com%2Fnews%2F2013-06-17%2Fare-free-trade-agreements-actually-protectionist-.html#axzz2YTL9wpn7>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

For Japan, the fact that it is an “anyone-but China club” is decisive. Shinzo Abe, the nationalist prime minister, regards membership as a chance to sit at the table with the big boys. When he recently committed Japan to joining, he said the TPP would help Japan’s “security” – hardly part of its official remit – and spoke of TPP members’ shared “values of freedom, democracy, basic human rights and the rule of law”. That description pointedly excluded China, yet somehow managed to accommodate Vietnam (an authoritarian Communist state) and Brunei (an Islamic Sultanate).With a need to accommodate such varied members, it is no wonder that TPP negotiations have dragged on. This week, the 17th round of talks is being held in Lima. The deadline for completion has slipped by more than a year. Few see any prospect of completing negotiations until the first half of 2014 at the earliest. Like all good free-trade agreements, the TPP will naturally contain plenty of protectionism and pandering to special interests. Japan will take rice off the table and the US sugar. No doubt Canada will want to protect its dairy farmers. There will also need to be careful wording on “currency manipulation” to please US manufacturers: here the trick will be to exclude China, whose currency has appreciated 40 per cent against the dollar in eight years, but include Japan, whose currency has fallen 25 per cent in less than eight months.The need for such artful “flexibility” suggests there will be nothing too onerous in the final agreement. Yet opponents of the TPP process say it has been hijacked by big business and that negotiations have been conducted under a veil of secrecy. By intruding into national law, they contend, TPP rules could endanger everything from labour standards to universal healthcare. Patent protection rules could make it harder to use generic medicines and rules on sanitary standards could compromise food safety, they say. Strict adherence to copyright protection could harm internet freedom. The list goes on. As a result of such concerns, it seems inevitable that the TPP will have to be watered down if it has any hope of being signed, let alone ratified by respective members’ parliaments. Even a diluted TPP might help the likes of Vietnam through giving it preferential market access and Japan through nudging industrial and agricultural reform. But it won’t turn the clock back. The Chinese cat is long out of the bag.

### Bilateral trade agreements = trade blocs

#### Bilateral Trade agreements cause protectionism

**Sutherland 2012**

(Peter, Special Representative of the Secretary General of the UN for Migration and former Director General of the WTO, “The Bilateral Threat to Free Trade,” 12-31-12, Project Syndicate, 7-10-13, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-doha-round-and-the-decline-of-the-world-trade-organization-by-peter-sutherland>)//KC

One of the WTO’s great achievements has been the adjudication system that it provides – the so-called Dispute Settlement Mechanism. This independent body has been a resounding success, giving the world an effective quasi-judicial system to resolve disputes between trading partners. But its continued success depends ultimately on the credibility of the WTO itself; it will inevitably suffer collateral damage from a failure of multilateral negotiations. Indeed, the current rush to bilateral trade agreements has been accompanied by a rise in protectionism. For example, there have been 424 new measures of this kind in the EU since 2008. Furthermore, the EU’s non-discriminatory tariffs are fully applicable to only nine trading partners. Everyone else has “exceptional” treatment.

#### Regional free trade agreements cause trade blocs that exclude developing countries

**Abida 2012**

(Montej, School of Business, University of Sfax, “The Regional Integration Agreements: A New Face of Protectionism,” 12-19-13, EBSCOhost, 7-7-13, http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2063/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9249d4de-a360-418e-b72f-89f0a2bd2536%40sessionmgr111&vid=17&hid=6)//KC

The first risk that the strategy of regional integration can cause is the negative impact on the multilateral trading system. But until now, no research has proved the existence of a full scale trade and investment. The effects of various regional integration agreements on trade in third countries can be summarized in a high probability of trade diversion towards countries of this agreement. It is thanks to the early work of Viner (1950) we observed that a regional integration agreement may result in a diversion of trade for the goods listed. This diversion depends on the form of the agreement of regional integration and trade policies of member countries. The second risk of a regional integration strategy can be summarized in a division of the commercial geography in regional blocs. The creation of dominant economic powers and protectionist may present a danger to the multilateral trading system. Indeed, the use of aggressive strategies by the major economic powers will have a negative impact on international trade relations: the use of a protectionist trade policy by one of the regional groups necessarily leads to retaliation and anti-reprisals therefore a trade war is likely to be triggered. The signing of several regional integration agreements concerned third countries about the future of their trade. The diversion of trade and investment to a regional grouping, which is not consistent with fundamental principles of the WTO can leave multilateralism in crisis. Indeed, whether the measures adopted by supporters of a trade agreement is not extended to third countries and regional preferences are maintained, there is a risk that third countries do not enjoy the same access to the large market of this regional group. The regional integration agreements attach great importance to the commercial interests of all parts of the regional group. Third countries that do not grant reciprocity, cannot take advantage of market access of a regional grouping. The solution that countries have adopted to avoid the risk of trade diversion is to join a regional group (Chaponnière and Vérez 2009). Thus, we saw the signing of several preferential trade agreements. While many agreements are not limited to countries of the same region, we speak of a PT A that can be a free-trade area or a customs union with a common external tariff.

#### Regional free trade agreements cause trade blocs that exclude developing countries

**Abida 2012**

(Montej, School of Business, University of Sfax, “The Regional Integration Agreements: A New Face of Protectionism,” 12-19-13, EBSCOhost, 7-7-13, http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2063/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=9249d4de-a360-418e-b72f-89f0a2bd2536%40sessionmgr111&vid=17&hid=6)//KC

The regional integration strategy has resulted in the organization of major geographical areas in delimited and protected trading blocs. Several economists have seen in regional integration agreements the sign of the advent of three regional groupings are the United States, the European Union and the Asia-Pacific region. The risk that these three great powers can cause to themselves is likely a deterioration in the international economic relations. Therefore, we are witnessing a polarization of international economic relations around these three major economic powers that are trying to attract the maximum number of countries to win more markets. The poles of the trade can only be economic superpowers that dominate all markets of goods and services. They are often made up of several countries to create a dynamic business inside the pole and try to attract the maximum number of other countries through a complete bond or a signature of a preferential agreement. Each pole tries to exert an influence on the international trading environment by encouraging countries to multiply trade relations with him. The pole strategy necessarily entails a regional concentration of trade in some areas that are economically powerful. Regional integration facilitates the construction of hegemonic and powerful regions. The creation of the European Union is a good example to demonstrate the existence of a hegemonic power capable of exerting influence on other countries. The enlargement process of the European Union helped the formation of an economic power that prompted other countries to join the group, or at least to sign preferential agreements in order to receive certain benefits such as market access to the European Union. The existence of hegemonic powers has much influence on the international trade relations that countries should set the trading bloc with whom they want to work. Each regional group aims to attract the maximum number of countries to form an economic or commercial power. The main purpose of an economic or commercial bloc is the domination of maximum market via a policy of enlargement or a signature of preferential agreements with third countries. The regional integration agreements are therefore creating commercial powers . One of the objectives of regional agreements is to address the major economic powers that dominate the commercial world. The race for regional agreements or the enlargement strategy of a regional group shows that the followed objectives have a hegemonic order. The more trading block is stronger. The more the third countries and other regional groups are wary and take more precautions in the use of their trade policies because they know it is difficult to address such market power.

### Bilateral trade agreements violate the WTO

#### Bilateral trade agreement cause fragmentation in the WTO

<http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/sppl_e/sppl246_e.htm>

Bilateral trade agreements cause fragmentation- countries seek better options

**WTO News 2012** (World Trade Organization, 9-20-12, 7-10-13, http://www.wto.org/english/news\_e/sppl\_e/sppl246\_e.htm)//KC

When the GATT first came into being in 1948, regional arrangements were considered exceptional. Indeed, it was not until the beginnings of the European integration process in the 1950s that a significant part of international trade was to become preferential. In the ensuing years, several other preferential agreements were established, but it was not until the 1980s that they started to become the significant component of world trade that it is today. The major increment in the number of agreements came in the 1990s. We can count almost 400 preferential trade agreements currently in existence, and each member of the WTO on average belongs to 13 separate agreements. A number of reasons can be adduced to explain their rising and continuing. They may serve political or strategic ends. Countries may wish to go further and faster in the direction of economic integration than they have been able to do in the WTO. They may be motivated by a fear of exclusion as competing countries secure better access to markets of interest. They may be an insurance policy against future protectionism. They may act as a signalling device to attract foreign investment. They may also serve as a vehicle for policy consolidation nationally, using an international obligation to make it harder for domestic interests to exert an influence over trade policy.

#### Bilateral trade agreements are causing marginalization in the WTO

**Sutherland 2012**

(Peter, Special Representative of the Secretary General of the UN for Migration and former Director General of the WTO, “The Bilateral Threat to Free Trade,” 12-31-12, Project Syndicate, 7-10-13, <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/the-doha-round-and-the-decline-of-the-world-trade-organization-by-peter-sutherland>)//KC

The non-discrimination principle ensured that global trade did not become a “spaghetti bowl” of preferential bilateral trade agreements. Moreover, a multilateral framework for trade negotiations gave weaker states far more balanced conditions than they would face were they forced to negotiate bilaterally with the likes of China, the United States, or the European Union. In fact, what we have seen in recent years is an increasing rush to bilateral agreements by the major trading countries and blocs. This has apparently consumed virtually all of their attention. The WTO has been marginalized, and even what has already been achieved in the incomplete Doha Round appears unlikely to be delivered in a final agreement in the foreseeable future. The damage to the credibility of the WTO – once lauded as the greatest advance in global governance since the inspired institution-building of the immediate postwar period – may yet prove lasting. Worse, it could have a serious impact not merely on trade, but on political relationships more generally.

### Bilateral trade agreements include protectionist measures

#### Trade liberalization doesn’t increase trade- hurts developing countries

**Begovic 2011**

(Selena, Teaching Assistant at School of Economics and Business, “The Effect of Free Trade Agreements on Bilateral Trade Flows: The Case of Cefta,” 2011, Proquest, 7-5-13, http://search.proquest.com/docview/913401427?accountid=7113)//KC

As trade policies between trading partners are believed to have a significant impact on bilateral trade flows, variables which reflect those policies are usually included in gravity model which estimate the determinants of trade flows between trading partners. In order to capture this effect it has become common in studies to include a dummy variable for free trade agreements in gravity models as a main feature of trade liberalisation. A common finding is that they appear to have significant positive effect on bilateral trade flows (e.g. Baier and Bergstrand, 2009; Caporale et. al, 2009). This positive effect is usually attributed to trade creation and trade diversion effects1. Though previous research on this topic is fairly conclusive, with results varying in different studies from small positive (Micco et al., 2003; Blomqvist, 2004) to large positive effect (Adam et al., 2003, Rose, 2004) of trade liberalisation on trade flows this finding is not universal, especially when considering small and underdeveloped countries like most of the current CEFTA member countries. Subasat (2008) argues that the relationship between trade liberalization and intensity of trade flows is not conclusive and that it depends on the sample specifics. Indeed, sensitivity analysis conducted by Yamarik and Ghosh (2005) suggests further caution about the supposed strong positive effect of FTA on trade than is the literature on this topic. They found that "trade creation result in most regional trading arrangements are not robust to changes in conditioning set of variables" (Yamarik and Ghosh, 2005, p. 111). Therefore, they conclude that the effect of FTAs should be determined on a case-by-case basis. The effect of trade liberalisation on bilateral trade flows depends on countries' potentials and capacities, especially where exports are concerned. Santos-Paulino (2004) notes that trade liberalisation usually has a positive effect on imports and exports, but that in developing countries it may worsen the balance of payment as in these countries imports are likely to rise faster than exports. Other important features that have to be considered and that can disturb the expected effect of trade liberalisation on bilateral trade flows are the historical and political circumstances and ethnic considerations in the countries which are liberalising their trade flows. These latter factors will be discussed in the context of CEFTA member countries in the next section.

#### Bilateral trade agreements include protectionist measures - pacts prove

Soltas 6-17-13 (The Ticker is Bloomberg View's blog dedicated to quick commentary on economics, politics and global affairs, “Are Free-Trade Agreements Actually Protectionist?” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-17/are-free-trade-agreements-actually-protectionist-.html>)

Are free-trade agreements protectionist? It sounds like a silly question, but it's always worth asking of regional (as opposed to global) trade pacts -- like the ones the U.S. is seriously considering with the European Union and the Pacific Rim. Economists are often mocked for free-trade worship, but they're skeptical when appropriate. Jacob Viner, a University of Chicago economist, argued in 1950 that free-trade agreements don’t necessarily promote free trade. Trade deals have two effects, he said: They create trade by lowering the cost of international exchange, but they also divert it by the selective reduction of barriers. Whether the first or the second effect predominates determines whether the deal is good or bad. To see this more clearly, imagine three countries, Viner wrote, and call them A, B and C. Country A can import a good from B and C. At the beginning, A has the same import tariffs against both. B produces the good less efficiently than C, so A buys the good from C. Then A and B make a trade agreement, but they leave out C. The reduction in tariffs leads A to buy the good from B, the less efficient producer. Now the world is worse off and trade more distorted.

### Regional Trade Agreements Violate credibility of the WTO

#### RTAs destroy the credibility of the WTO-excess of multilateral partners

**Leal-Arcas 2011**

(Rafael, a Senior Research Fellow at the World Trade Institute and a Senior Lecturer in International Economic Law, “Proliferation of Regional Trade Agreements: Complementing or Supplanting Multilateralism?,” Chicago Journal of International Law, Winter 2011, ProQuest, 7-5-13, http://search.proquest.com/docview/855631997/13F1625DC522878C31F/8?accountid=7113)//KC

With the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995, the pyramidal design of the international trading system placed multilateralism at the top of the pyramid, regionalism/bilateralism in the middle, and the domestic trade and economic policies of WTO Member States at the bottom of the pyramid. This article questions whether this vertical structure is still die case today, given the tremendous proliferation of regional trade agreements (RTAs) in recent years and the fact that the WTO is losing its centrality in the international trading system.1 The thesis of this article is that the multilateral trading system's single undertaldng" is no longer feasible because the WTO has more Members than ever (and WTO membership is an ongoing process, with more Members to come in the near future) and covers more topics than ever, which, in mm, are more complex than ever. This explains RTA proliferation as the modus operandi for trade liberalization. This article also argues that RTA proliferation implies the erosion of the WTO law principle of nondiscrimination and endangers the multilateral trading system. RTAs can help countries integrate into the multilateral trading system, but are also a fundamental departure from the principle of non-discrimination. This raises the question of whether RTAs are a building block for further multilateral liberalization or a stumbling block.4

#### RTAs destroy the credibility of the WTO- multilateral discrimination

**Leal-Arcas 2011**

(Rafael, a Senior Research Fellow at the World Trade Institute and a Senior Lecturer in International Economic Law, “Proliferation of Regional Trade Agreements: Complementing or Supplanting Multilateralism?,” Chicago Journal of International Law, Winter 2011, ProQuest, 7-5-13, http://search.proquest.com/docview/855631997/13F1625DC522878C31F/8?accountid=7113)//KC

RTAs can help countries integrate into the multilateral trading system, but at the same time they are a fundamental departure from the WTO principle of non-discrimination that obliges WTO Members to grant unconditionally to each other any benefit, favor, privilege, or immunity affecting customs duties, charges, rules, and procedures that they give to products originating in or destined for any other Member country. So RTAs are a fundamental departure from the WTO principle of non-discrimination because, by definition, they provide preferential treatment to the parties to the agreement.12 This means that a WTO Member would be in breach of its WTO obligations if it were to grant preferential treatment to products originating only from a selected group of countries. However, the WTO does allow its Members to enter into RTAs under three basic rules: (1) GATT Article XXIV:4-10, (2) the Enabling Clause, and (3) Article V of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). Therefore, the question is whether RTAs are a building block for further multilateral liberalization (one of the fundamental principles of WTO law) or a stumbling block.13

#### RTAs destroy multilateral trade negotiations- laundry list of reasons

**Leal-Arcas 2011**

(Rafael, a Senior Research Fellow at the World Trade Institute and a Senior Lecturer in International Economic Law, “Proliferation of Regional Trade Agreements: Complementing or Supplanting Multilateralism?,” Chicago Journal of International Law, Winter 2011, ProQuest, 7-5-13, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/855631997/13F1625DC522878C31F/8?accountid=7113)//KC>

However, there are also negative effects of RTAs on the multilateral trading system. There is less enthusiasm for multilateral trade negotiations (like that of the Doha Round) when regionalism is doing well, which is currently the case. The current proliferation of RTAs also creates less transparency in the multilateral trading system and rules (that is, the so-called spaghetti bowl, as can be seen in map 5 below), because it is not clear who is doing what with whom, given that everyone is concluding RTAs with everyone. This lower level of transparency in the multilateral trading rules results in traders being subject to multiple, sometimes conflicting, requirements. Trade and investment diversion could be another negative effect of RTAs on the multilateral trading system. However, some scholars argue that regional trade liberalization may create (rather than divert) significant economic growth within a region, which can, in turn, generate more trade with the rest of the world.95 In this respect, after analyzing a report by the Asian Development Bank published in 2008,% Masahiro Kawai and Ganeshan Wignaraja found "that business in the [Asian] region tend to view FTAs as a benefit rather than a burden, and that they use them to expand trade to a far greater degree than had been previously thought."97 That said, economic studies of FTAs have shown that the trade-creation effects may often be smaller than the trade-diversion effects, given that trade between the participants replaces trade between the participants and non-participants. It seems, therefore, that it is not clear whether RTAs create or divert trade.98 Another effect of RTAs is arguably that the weakest countries tend to be left out. Furthermore, there is a risk of polarization in the international trading system with the tremendous proliferation of RTAs currently taking place. As such, four large regions appear to emerge as a result of RTA proliferation: (1) the European RTA network,99 (2) the Western hemisphere RTA network (NAFTA, Mercosur,100 the Andean Community,101 the Caribbean Community (CARICOM)102), (3) the Asia-Pacific RTA network,103 and (4) the African RTA network.

### Export credits = protectionist

#### Export credit agencies recently tied to protectionist measures

**Expropriation News 13** (“Familiar faces top the protectionist league table,” *Expropriation News*, 6/28/2013, <http://expropriationnews.com/2013/06/28/familiar-faces-top-the-protectionist-league-table/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Argentina and Russia, via their respective seizures of oil companies YPF and Yukos, have earned a reputation for expropriation in recent years. And according to recent research produced by France’s export credit agency Coface, the two countries are also guilty of trade protectionism. In its assessment of the radical transformation of risks in emerging countries, Coface highlights a series of measures taken in emerging countries during the last two years concerning preferential access to public markets for domestic businesses (Brazil, India, South Africa), import quotas (Argentina, Brazil, Russia) and taxes on imports (China, Argentina). In terms of existing protectionist measures by country, Coface’s data show that Argentina and Russia are by far the most protectionist states (respectively 180 and 136 measures each). The agency says the current rise in protectionism has its origin in the changes in emerging countries’ growth strategies: after undergoing a contraction in world trade in 2009, some emerging countries decided to favour sectors related to their domestic demand. From this perspective, protectionist decisions are aimed at protecting these developing sectors. The two most protectionist states have a generalized animus towards foreign investors. In Argentina’s case, says Coface, foreign investments are tiny (just 1.4% of GDP), as investors have been put off by the government’s interventionist policy, which led to the expropriation of the Repsol subsidiary, YPF, in 2012. The seizure of YPF, and the introduction of protectionist measures have led to complaints being lodged by various countries with the World Trade Organisation. There is now, warns Coface, a risk of a breakdown in relations with the IMF and expulsion from the G20 group of industrialised countries. In Russia, it says the weakness of the legal framework and of that of property rights protection curbs investment. Governance suffers from a lack of transparency (particularly in terms of shareholdings). Corruption is widespread, notes Coface, leading to Russia being ranked 133rd (out of 176) according to the Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index.

#### Export credits don’t facilitate free trade – challenged by the WTO

**Drake 12** (Elizabeth J., served on the Labor Advisory Committee on Trade Policy and Negotiations to the U.S. Trade Representative and on the planning committee for the Court of International Trade’s 16th Judicial Conference. She is the author and co-author of a variety of publications on international trade matters, including articles on climate change, China’s exchange rate policies, WTO rules on balance of payment measures, Buy America laws, and trade and labor rights, “How Trade Rules Can Help Level the Export Financing Playing Field: New Developments and a Path Forward for 2013,” *Stewart and Stewart*, 11/16/2012, <http://www.stewartlaw.com/Article/ViewArticle/608>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

A Roadmap for 2013: Fortunately, the U.S. does have significant leverage to push for an agreement with China that builds on, rather than retreats from, the current OECD Arrangement. Whether or not it maximizes that leverage over the next year will likely determine how meaningful any new agreement will be. As noted above, the United Steelworkers’ section 301 petition on China’s green technology policies included allegations that China’s export financing system violates WTO rules. More specifically, the petition alleged that China’s export credits and export credit insurance are prohibited export subsidies under the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (“SCMA”). China’s export credits appear to meet all the criteria for a prohibited export subsidy, because they are from a government entity, they are contingent on export performance, and they appear to be provided at below-market rates. There is an exception in the SCMA for export credits that comply with the terms of the OECD Arrangement or any successor agreement; export credits that do comply fall within the SCMA’s safe harbor and are not prohibited under WTO rules. If China’s export credits were challenged at the WTO, however, and the challenger made out a prima facie case that the credits are export subsidies, it is China that would bear the burden of demonstrating that its export credits comply with OECD terms and are therefore permitted. China’s export credit insurance also appears to be a prohibited subsidy under WTO rules, as it is provided by a government entity, contingent on export performance, and the premiums that Sinosure charges are inadequate to cover the long-term operating costs and losses of the program. If China’s export credits and export credit insurance were challenged and found to be prohibited subsidies under WTO rules, China would have to bring the programs into compliance or face the prospect of the withdrawal of trade benefits. To bring its export credit programs into compliance, China would have to conform its credits to OECD rules – Brazil, for example, though not a member of the OECD, now observes the OECD rules for aircraft export financing as the result of a WTO challenge to its programs. To bring its export credit insurance program into compliance, China would have to raise premiums sufficiently to cover the program’s costs and losses. In short, while China is neither a member of the OECD nor a party to the OECD Arrangement, it nonetheless has an obligation to comply with the Arrangement by virtue of its membership in the WTO. But WTO obligations are not self-executing where a country does not comply voluntarily. The only way to enforce the rules is for a member country to challenge China’s practices at the WTO. If the U.S. and China are successful in negotiating an agreement and it is accepted by other OECD members, it will qualify as a “successor agreement” in the SCMA’s safe harbor provision for export credits. This would protect China’s export credits from future WTO challenge as long as they are made consistent with the agreement. If the U.S. and China do not reach an agreement, however, the U.S. will still have the right to challenge China’s export credit policies at the WTO, and that challenge will likely be successful if the U.S. can make out a prima facie case and China cannot demonstrate that its export credits comply with the existing set of OECD rules.

### Joint ventures = protectionist

**Joint ventures result in threats of protectionism – playing the card**

**Asiimwe 13** (Dicta, Special Correspondent, “Concern as partner states play the protectionist card,” *The East African*, 1/26/2013,

<http://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/news/Concern-as-partner-states-play-the-protectionist-card/-/2558/1676166/-/dipk4p/-/index.html>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Concern as partner states play the protectionist card The East African Community Secretariat may not meet its target of opening up and reforming the tourism sector this year as partner states continue to play the protectionist card. Despite signing up in 2010, Uganda has in a swift turn taken the stand against foreign tour operators, taking the cue from other EAC partner states whom it accuses of maintaining non-tariff barriers in tourism. The reforms include providing single tourist visas, opening up the region’s airspace and a common passport. Under the East African Common Market Protocol (EACMP), Uganda signed to open its borders to tour operators from EAC partner states in 2013, and tour guides in 2015. Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi opened up to tour operators in 2010. Uganda needed the extra years to shore up itscapacity of tour operators. The signing of the EACMP should have guaranteed tour operators access to all tourist attraction sites and activities, except for gorilla tracking where permits are necessary.  The protocol demanded that non-Ugandan companies form joint ventures with local firms when in need of gorilla permits. Tour operators, backed by officials from the Ministry of East African Community Affairs  and those from the Ministry of Tourism now want Uganda to rescind its position, arguing that the country is not ready to open its borders to especially Tanzanian and Kenyan operators.  “Government needs to invest in some affirmative action for our operators before we can open up,” says Cuthbert Baguma, the chief executive  of Uganda Tourism Board, arguing that bigger players from Kenya and Tanzania would swallow up Ugandan firms if the country was to open up now.

#### Joint ventures are a barrier to free trade

Clement 2012 (Benjamin Clement, 5-4-12, “Free Trade: America’s Common Enemy”, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/free-trade-americas-common-enemy>)

The reality is, tariffs are not the only barrier to fair trade. Trade is impacted by much more intangible state-sponsored “trade weapons” such as currency manipulation, technology transfer requirements, joint-venture policies, selective customs policies, underhanded government subsidies and countless other tools. Under “free trade” agreements, the U.S. essentially relies on faith-based economic policy with other countries. We agree to play ball by the rules and, because of the nature of the game, are unable to ensure that others play fair.

### Aid = protectionist

#### Government assistance is associated with protectionism (unilateral free trade)

**Garst 12** (Brian, Master's degree in Political Science and work in public policy for a non-profit, “An Unconvincing Case for Protectionism,” *Conservative Compendium*, 12/5/2012, <http://conservative-compendium.com/wordpress/2012/12/an-unconvincing-case-for-protectionism/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

He goes on to say that government assistance shouldn’t be too high, nor should it involve dictating business practices. That’s not enough; it shouldn’t exist at all. I agree with Milton Friedman’s view that even unilateral free trade is a better option than meeting subsidies with subsidies and tariffs with tariffs. If Brazil wants to “plow another $1 trillion into its sugar market over the next few decades,” we should let them. It’s money straight from their taxpayers pockets and into the hands of US consumers. It harms them, not us. As for the 142,000 US jobs supposedly on the line, it’s not either/or. The choice is not between subsidizing US sugar or seeing those people forced into unemployment. Their labor can be used elsewhere, and when combined with lower sugar prices than we would have otherwise seen if not for Brazilian subsidies, the net result is greater production for us. We get cheap sugar and we get whatever else those 142,000 people are able to produce. The only real loser in this equation is the Brazilian taxpayer.

### Loans = protectionist

#### Loans give the debt holder trade authority over the country – can restrict importers

Roos 2013 (PhD Researcher on the European Debt Crisis at the European University Institute in Florence. He is the founder and editor of ROAR Magazine, an online journal,, 4-5-13, “Heading for a lost decade? Latin lessons for Europe”

<http://roarmag.org/2013/04/lost-decade-latin-american-europen-debt-crisis/>)

This ability to withhold and withdraw credit — which would have had dramatic consequences for the ability of Latin American governments to import food or oil, for instance, or to continue funding basic social expenditures — gave the Wall Street banks a unique form of structural power over debtor governments. Working together closely with the US Fed, the Treasury Department and the IMF, large bailouts were organized that imposed highly punitive conditions on the debtors, while always insisting on full repayment for the banks.

#### Loans don’t open up trade – leadership corruption proves

Hutchinson 5-13-13 (Martin Hutchinson is formerly Business and Economics Editor at United Press International., Into a Protectionist World, <http://www.prudentbear.com/2013/05/into-protectionist-world.html#.Ud4iHfmTiSq>)

This is a pity. Of all the world's bloated crop of international organizations, the WTO is the only one that has a useful function. The World Bank makes loans to the Third World that, being directed through government, mostly end up in ministers' pockets. The IMF provides some of the worst financial advice ever, taking bread out of the mouths of honest private sector merchant bankers. And the United Nations' principal purpose is to hamstring the attempts of the United States and other powers to preserve world peace and reduce the number of countries ruled by dictators and kleptocrats.

### Economic engagement = protectionist

#### Intervention and engagement results in selective economic action not global trade - leaders use nationalism to justify economic decisions

Costa 2013 (Anthony Costa - Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, “Selective engagement with the global economy, prioritizing growth, spurs inequality”, <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/nations-can-try-promotion-%E2%80%93-not-protectionism>)

National security arguments also prompt intervention, such as scrutiny by the US government of Chinese telecommunications firms, like Huawei and ZTE, to sell in the American market. Upset about the elimination of any French jobs, the French government threatened to nationalize ArcelorMittal units in France, owned by an Indian steel magnate, after he proposed closing two inactive blast furnaces. Not all states intervene, though, too often indifferent, even callous to the plight of their citizens. In fact, most states fail to govern their economies well in the face of challenges and opportunities emanating from the world economy. Only a few states have the capacity to intervene effectively. Today these include ambitious developing states such as Brazil, Russia, China and India, known as BRIC, and East Asian economies. These countries have a history of state-led development with global and regional political and economic ambitions in the midst of other powerful states. The concept of economic nationalism is used for selective engagement with the world economy. Rather than the orthodox notion of economic nationalism, defensive in nature and nation-centered, I offer a more dynamic understanding – economic nationalism in motion. This version, first proposed in the Review of International Political Economy, 2009, suggests that the practice is influenced by pragmatic considerations rather than ideology – akin to Deng Xiaoping’s proverbial cat that catches mice irrespective of its color – especially under fluid circumstances of economic growth, emerging competitive industries and, most importantly, as national capitalists mature. Earlier economic nationalism meant protection; today it’s promotion, though the basic motive for both is ensuring national economic interests. This ability to navigate changing circumstances and priorities pragmatically contributes to the dynamic movement of the practice of economic nationalism.

# Free Trade Good - Impact Debate

## General – Peace and Conflict

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade creates relations that foster peace and resolve conflict

Foulkes 2012 (“The Magic of Free Trade,” 10-22-12, <http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/the-magic-of-free-trade#axzz2YCcbjJVp>, SP)

What’s more, free trade among nations is a way to promote peaceful international relations. When individuals are free to trade across political boundaries, they are more likely to view “foreigners” positively. The mutual benefits of trade, in other words, can promote peace. Ricardo, one of the most influential economists of all time, was among the first to understand the great value of free trade. In his Principles of Political Economy and Taxation (1817) he summed up the benefits of free international trade nicely: Under a system of perfectly free commerce, each country naturally devotes its capital and labor to such employments as are most beneficial to each. This pursuit of individual advantage is admirably connected with the universal good of the whole. . . . [It] distributes labor most effectively and most economically; while, by increasing the general mass of productions, it diffuses general benefit, and binds together, by one common tie of interest and intercourse, the universal society of nations throughout the civilized world. Free trade gets a bad rap from domestic producers and protectionists of all sorts. But nothing is more important to a growing, dynamic economy than allowing the basic human right to freely and peacefully exchange with others.

### Peace and Conflict Exts

#### Regional Trade Alliances reduce the risk of war

**Vicard 2012**

(Vincent, economist at Banque de France since 2009, “Trade, conflict, and political integration: Explaining the heterogeneity of regional trade agreements,” Banque de France, January 2012, Science Direct, 7-5-13, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0014292111000766)//KC

The literature in international relations identifies two channels through which regional trade integration is likely to affect international insecurity (Bearce, 2003).2 First, since war disrupts bilateral trade (Martin et al., 2008 and Glick and Taylor, 2010), an RTA increases the opportunity cost of war by increasing intra-regional trade (Martin et al., 2008, Polachek, 1980 and Oneal and Russett, 1999). Second, supranational institutions created in relation to regional integration promote the exchange of information on military capabilities and resolve and patience in conflicts, through formal security/military substructures, joint military exercises and forums of defence ministers. Moreover, regular meetings of head of states and high level officials or the existence of an executive secretariat create habits of negotiation and build trust between political leaders.3 International institutions are thus likely to reduce asymmetries of information in conflicts and to mitigate problems of credible commitment in interstate negotiations, which reduces the probability that a dispute escalates into war (Fearon, 1995 and Grossman, 2004).4

#### **FTA’s negotiate trade issues and avoid conflicts**

Martin, Mayer, & Thoenig, Professors of Economics for Sciences Po and University of Geneva, 2010, Phillippe, Thierry & Mathias,“The economics and politics of free trade agreements”, Vox, April 9 2010, <http://www.voxeu.org/article/free-trade-agreements-do-they-help-keep-peace>, 7/5/13, JG

In such a world, what would explain that certain country pairs sign FTAs and others do not? The first determinant is the standard economic gains of an FTA which come, in particular, from a lower price of imports. We estimate those for all country pairs over the period 1950-2000 and find that indeed they participate in predicting which country pairs sign FTAs. Economics does matter. The political or strategic benefits of signing an FTA come in two parts. The, which political scientists have called the “political forum channel”, is that FTAs come with first various institutions in which countries negotiate about trade issues but often (this is clearly the case for the EU but also for Mercosur and ASEAN) those discussions spillover to political issues to attempt to diffuse political disputes that could escalate into conflicts.¶ How can we identify this perceived political gain from FTAs? Our argument is that the benefit of this political forum channel effect should be stronger for those country pairs that indeed run the risk of experiencing an escalation of a dispute into a military conflict. We proxy this risk by the history of old wars that countries experienced over the period 1870-1945. We indeed find that those country pairs that experienced a high number of conflicts in the past are more likely to sign FTAs. Politics does matter. The second political benefit in signing FTAs is that the Liberal Peace argument is based on the idea that the subsequent bilateral trade gains increase the opportunity cost of war as a military conflict would destroy those gains by destroying trade. This means that this second benefit is conditional on the existence of trade gains. Without trade gains the economic opportunity cost of war is lower. This mechanism is at work in the geography of FTAs for country pairs that both have large trade gains from signing an FTA (the size of the opportunity cost) and are at risk of a dispute that may escalate into a conflict. We indeed find that country pairs with large estimated trade gains from signing an FTA and who experienced a high number of conflicts in the past are more likely to sign FTAs. Economics and politics are complements.

## Democracy Good

### 1NC/1AC Module

**Free Trade Key to Democracy- allows for the breakdown of autocrats**

**Liu and Ornelas,** Associate Professor of Economics at Kennesaw State University

And Reader in the Managerial Economics and Strategy Group, London School of Economics,

**2011**

(Xuepeng and Emanuel, “Free trade agreements and the consolidation of democracy”, VOX, May 11, <http://www.voxeu.org/article/free-trade-agreements-and-consolidation-democracy>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

The economic effects of free trade agreements are widely studied, but what about their political impact? Using data from over 125 countries over the past 60 years, this column argues that by removing protectionism, free trade can lower the government’s power and hence the incentives of autocrats to hold office. All this can help strengthen democracy.“Striking down trade barriers is critical to sustaining democracy […] throughout the region.” Former US President George W Bush, April 2001.When the US announced the intention to pursue a free trade agreement with Central American countries, one of the three explicit goals was “to support democracy in the region”. The demand of Eastern and Central European countries for membership in the EU has similarly been linked to the countries’ democratic concerns. In fact, governments often declare “promoting democracy and political stability” as a central force behind their decision to form regional trade agreements (WTO 2011). Of course, this may just be mere rhetoric. But maybe there is some truth in it.Consider Figure 1. The bars show the cumulative number of free trade agreements (FTAs) in force, while the solid line shows the cumulative number of transitions to democracy throughout the world since 1948. Both trends have accelerated since the early 1990s. The dotted line shows instead the cumulative number of transitions to autocracies; this trend has visibly slowed down since the 1980s. We argue that these phenomena are not independent from each other.In recent research (Ornelas and Liu 2011), we present evidence that participation in free trade agreements can destroy protectionist rents. They can also serve as commitment devices to destroy future protectionist rents. Since such rents are attractive for autocratic groups, FTAs can lower their incentives to seek power. While this has little value in established democracies, where the rule of law is strong and the risk of authoritarian disruption is negligible, it can be important for unstable democracies. These threatened states should therefore have an extra incentive to seek involvement in FTAs, over and above the incentive stemming from the agreements’ potential trade gains.We provide the theoretical basis for our claims by extending the trade integration model of Ornelas (2005) to allow for endogenous changes in the political regime. At any trade regime domestic firms exchange contributions for protection with the government, which cares about national welfare and the contributions it receives. Key to understand the impact of an FTA is the recognition that the equilibrium external tariffs change with the constraint imposed by the agreement on the internal tariffs. Taking this into account, it can be shown that even though an FTA still permits lobbying for protection against excluded countries, the volume of protectionist rents falls after the formation of the agreement. In a dynamic setting this implies that, all else equal, groups motivated mainly by office rents will have lower incentives to seek power if the country is deeply engaged in FTAs. Authoritarian groups tend to fit this description best. After all, due to their aptitude to resort to violence to keep power, authoritarian groups have less incentive to pursue policies that favour the population at large than democratic ones. If the gain of authoritarian groups from keeping power falls when the country is engaged in FTAs, but the costs and risks from attempting a coup d’état are unaltered by the agreements, the likelihood of democratic failure will therefore be lower if the country participates more intensively in FTAs.Accordingly, if the incumbent government in an unstable democracy realises this effect of “democratic consolidation,” it will seek participation in FTAs more actively than it would otherwise. The reason is two-fold.First, an FTA will weaken the authoritarian threat, increasing the likelihood of democracy survival. Second, even if the dictatorial group takes control despite the FTA, the agreement will constrain its rent-extraction activities. Hence, unstable democracies tend to enter in FTAs more frequently than other countries, all else being equal.

#### Democratic decisionmaking is best for the environment, spreads risks proportionately and includes more voices into the equation

[Akash Goreeba](http://www.e-ir.info/author/akash-goreeba/) [writing for E-International Relations, an online resource and news outlet for global affairs] [Environmental Democracy? Does Anyone Really Care?](http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/26/environmental-democracy-does-anyone-really-care/) October 26, 2012

<http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/26/environmental-democracy-does-anyone-really-care/>

It is not surprising that EU policy has placed emphasis on just sustainability a year after and EU governance white paper was produced (2001). In this White Paper, ‘’the modernization of European governance is seen as a necessary precondition for European integration through a process of decentralization, combating the impact of globalization, and a restoration of faith in democracy through wider involvement in decision making’’ (Agyeman & Evans 2004, p.162).¶ We have seen from the above the problematic of environmental justice. It is arguably particularly difficult when considered in the global context. It is not surprising that attempts to safeguard and provide environmental justice have now taken a small scale dimension. An example of a more small scale attempt at addressing the effects on environmental justice/injustice is the Environmental Justice Showcase Community by the EPA (environmental protection agency). Recently it was announced that the State of Jacksonville USA had been selected for the pilot scheme which would see a cash injection of over $100,000 by the EPA which would go towards addressing the environmental issues suffered by low income and minority communities.¶ ‘’EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson announced that, under the initiative, Jacksonville will be one of the national models for EPA’s commitment to EJ efforts. EJ refers to the disproportionate environmental burdens placed on low-income and minority communities’’ (EPA News Release, 04/2010). The project aims at working with the likes of schools, community organisations, local residents, as well as federal agencies. Greg Strong, Florida Department of Environmental Protection’s Northeast District Director stated that ‘’we can achieve much more collectively, when we combine and leverage our resources, than as stand-alone organizations working independently… This kick-off event is an excellent way for us to find new opportunities to work collaboratively with our partners in order to benefit the local community and further improve human health and the environment’’(EPA News Release, 04/2010).¶ Those such as the EJF (Environmental Justice Foundation) have already done well to illustrate the usefulness of small scale local and community projects aimed at addressing environmental injustices, the EJF essentially operates via providing film and advocacy training and empowering ‘’local’’ communities. Some notable examples where this has been successful include the Cambodian Fisheries Action Coalition Team, or (FACT). The Team aimed to resolve conflicts over freshwater fisheries, in short the EJC ‘’ trained and equipped FACT with essential cameras, computer equipment, internet access and GPS systems. And thereby helped FACT gather essential information and testimonies and co-produced ‘Feast or Famine’, which was launched at a meeting hosted by the UK Ambassador to Cambodia and attended by World Bank, IMF and other representatives of the donor community, helping to put the issues firmly on the political agenda’’ (EJF 2010).¶ Other examples include the EJF’s ‘’educating on nature in Vietnam’’, ‘’CEDAC’’ aimed at reducing the use of deadly pesticides in Cambodia, and ‘’JALA’’ aimed at combating illegal fishing and helping poor fisherman in Sumatra. All the examples above have in common that they operated in the ‘’local’’ communities. Perhaps it is the case that both democracy and justice are best implemented at a local level.¶ We have looked at the importance as well as the problematic nature of environmental democracy and justice. As problematic as the two are, their importance are undeniable. There are numerous organisations and NGO’s that are dedicated to ensuring environmental democracy and justice, some of which have been discussed above. In a world where we are witnessing environmental degradation and problems globally, effective democracy and justice is a necessity.¶ Good environmental governance equates to good environmental democracy/justice. We have seen how minorities have suffered disproportionate environmental dis-benefits. In a supposed free world it is only fair that everyone should be allowed to experience both the risks and benefits associated with the environment, as well as future generations to come. And whilst from the above it is clear that environmental democracy/justice has a long way to go, it has done well so far to deal with many environmental issues globally, usually small scale and local. But it is undoubtedly the case that small scale localised efforts are most effective. It remains to be seen whether implementation of small scale localised agendas ‘’globally’’ will prove fruitful. And whilst the likes of Agyeman above, have argued that the majority of environmental issues ‘’fail to register a signal’, this is undeniably changing. Thanks to the efforts of the many who go out of their way to make consideration for the environment a key part of modern life.

### Democracy Exts

**Trade promotes reform- creates democracy**

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Economic growth in the Arab world thus became a matter of strategic importance and trade, a weapon of choice to fight terrorism for the United States (Looney, 2005). According to that line of thought, the path to ensuring American security has to go through the creation of better social and economic opportunities in the Arab world. This entails “policies that encourage domestic and Foreign Direct Investment, (…) a competitive private sector and strong trade relations with the West” (Dadush & Dunne, 2011: 143). More specifically, without a strong private sector, one cannot solve the issue of rampant unemployment in the region. Trade agreements are thought to tackle this issue as they provide local private actors with funds to undertake their projects through FDI. In addition, exposition to the international market is thought to encourage competition and productivity in local markets. Local actors will have to align with international trade rules, thus pushing for local reforms and improving the local business climate. The result, the thinking goes, is the creation of a virtuous circle of growth. In the last stage of this development, the pressure to reform will translate politically into the creation of a democracy (Dadush & Dunne, 2011: 135; Nasr 2009). In sum, free trade will soak up unemployment, generate economic growth and by way of consequence, it will diminish social instability and create the conditions for a democratic and stable Middle East.

#### Free trade has a correlation with democratic success – studies prove

Liu 2012 (Xuepeng Liu, Kennesaw State University “Free Trade Agreements and the Consolidation of Democracy”, <http://personal.lse.ac.uk/ornelas/Liu&Ornelas_lastversion.pdf>)

We study the relationship between a country’s participation in free trade agreements and the sustainability of its democracy. We develop a model centered on the destruction of rents caused by FTAs. The model delivers two main results. First, deeper engagement in FTAs increases the longevity of democracies. Second, political instability promotes FTA participation. Relying on the concept of democratic capital developed by Persson and Tabellini (2009) to estimate countries’ hazards out of democracy, we test and confirm our two main predictions in a sample of 116 countries over almost 50 years. Our results suggest that the rent destruction forces of FTAs constitute an important channel through which our predictions manifest. Our measure of FTA intensity is aimed at capturing those forces. Moreover, the predictions hold for “proper,” GATT 1947-compatible free trade areas and customs unions, but not for partial-scope agreements based on GATT’s Enabling Clause. We also find that the impact of FTAs on democracy survival is not greater when the partners are more democratic, so it is not simply that some countries demand democracy from their FTA partners. It is not that general political competition induces FTA formation either; it is the uncertainty related to the possibility of major changes in the political regime that matters. While all this is “good news” for democratic countries involved in FTAs, we must emphasize that participation in FTAs is, unsurprisingly, no panacea: they can help to consolidate democracies, but their reach is limited. Our estimates make this limit clear. The effect is nevertheless comparable to that of some of the main forces highlighted in the literature, such as the spread and strength of democracies in neighboring countries. Similarly, although we have found that democratic instability compels governments to engage in FTAs, there are as well many reasons other than democratic instability that also foster participation in FTAs. Our study pushes forward a small but growing literature (largely in political science) that seeks to uncover links between democracy and FTA participation. We depart from it by focusing on a specific mechanism—the destruction of rents in FTAs—that allows us to be more precise about the relationship. The paper also provides a clear departure from the perspective often taken by economists studying regionalism, who tend to focus on the strictly economic aspects of its causes and consequences.38 Purely economic motives certainly help, but cannot fully explain the intensity of the ongoing outbreak of free trade agreements, which have become the main trade policy instrument in many countries.39 We show that the instability of democracies is another important contributing factor to this trend. Yet much remains to be known about the interplay between trade agreements and democracy. We look forward to future research to further illuminate this relationship.

## Agriculture

### 1NC/1AC Module

**Free Trade Key to Farms- California and Arizona prove**

**Growers, 2011**

(Western, “Free trade deals good for nation’s farm economy”, Western Farm Press, July 8, <http://westernfarmpress.com/government/free-trade-deals-good-nation-s-farm-economy>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

During informal mark-ups, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee approved three pending free trade agreements that will benefit the fresh produce industry. Trade pacts with the United States and South Korea, Panama and Colombia will help fresh produce farmers who depend on export markets throughout the world to compete on the global stage. After debating the agreements, both committees approved all three agreements. “We applaud the Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee for their approval of these agreements. While this is only the first step in the process, it’s clear that these free trade agreements will give our family farmers the competitive advantage they need for success in key international markets,” said Ken Barbic, director of federal government affairs for Western Growers. California is the nation’s leading agricultural exporter. Nearly 20 percent of California’s agricultural production is exported to international markets annually, totaling more than $12.5 billion. Arizona agricultural exports exceed $625 million. Without the adoption of these agreements, California and Arizona farms may face the loss of market share as other countries enjoy various trade agreements. The U.S.-Korea FTA will provide the largest net export benefit to the U.S. specialty crop industry of any FTA. Korea is already the seventh largest export market for U.S. fruit, vegetables and tree nuts. While Colombia enjoys duty-free access to our market on specialty crops, California and Arizona growers are subject to applied tariffs ranging anywhere from 5 percent to 20 percent. For Panama, growers face tariffs ranging 5 percent to 15 percent. South Korea applies tariff rate quotas and maintains tariffs up to 50 percent on key specialty crops. “Exports are essential to high value, specialty crop commodities from California, Arizona and the rest of the country,” Barbic said. “We hope the Congress will quickly approve these agreements, so U.S. producers can reap the benefits.”

**Most likely scenario for war**

**F**uture **D**irections **I**nternational **’12** (“International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points Resulting from Food and Water Insecurity Global Food and Water Crises Research Programme”, May 25, <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/files/Workshop_Report_-_Intl_Conflict_Triggers_-_May_25.pdf>, CMR)

There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. . He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” “Hunger feeds anarchy.” This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.

### Free Trade Key to Agriculture – Exts

#### Free Trade key to Agriculture Sector- South Dakota proves

**Montgomery**, Journal Staff, **2011**

(David, “Free trade agreements should boost agriculture business in South Dakota”, Rapid City Journal, October 13, <http://rapidcityjournal.com/news/free-trade-agreements-should-boost-agriculture-business-in-south-dakota/article_b0d50aea-f548-11e0-b3d1-001cc4c002e0.html>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

Three new free trade agreements approved by Congress Wednesday are expected to boost South Dakota's agricultural sector, though some worry they will have darker consequences. The agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama will lower or eliminate tariffs on both sides, thus making American products cheaper in those countries - while making their products cheaper in the Untied States. "Ratification of trade agreements will mean new jobs and expanded markets for ag products and many other goods," said Sen. John Thune, R-S.D., a vocal proponent of the trade agreements. State Secretary of Agriculture Walt Bones also praised the trade agreements as meaning good things for the South Dakota farmers and ranchers. "These free trade agreements are good things for agriculture, there's no doubt about it," Bones said. He cited estimates from the American Farm Bureau Federation that the three agreements will increase South Dakota agriculture exports by just over $50 million per year. The state's agriculture sector had about $6.8 billion in revenue in 2009. According to the Farm Bureau's statistics, beef exports to South Korea are a particular growth opportunity. The gradual elimination of South Korea's 40 percent tariff on beef, the Farm Bureau predicts, will add around $21 million to South Dakota's economy.

### Free Trade Solves Food Prices

#### Protectionism jacks food prices- distorts global food trade and allows wealthy nations to undercut poorer nation’s prices

Alison Fitzgerald and Mark Drajem [writing for Bloomberg News]¶ June 19, 2008¶ Free Trade in Food Is `On the Ropes' Amid Shortages, Price Rise¶ <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=ao7aZdufhFQE>

Free-trade policies long advanced by World Bank President [Robert Zoellick](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Robert+Zoellick&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1) and U.S. President[George W. Bush](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=George+W.%0ABush&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1) are losing favor as countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America find they can't buy enough food to feed their people.¶ Global food [prices](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=FAOFOODI:IND) have spiked 60 percent since the beginning of 2007, sparking riots in more than 30 countries that depend on imported food, including Cameroon and Egypt. The surge in prices threatens to push the number of malnourished people in the world from 860 million to almost 1 billion, according to the [World Food Programme](http://wfp.org/" \t "_blank) in Rome.¶ Leaders of developing nations including the Philippines, Gambia and El Salvador now say the only way to nourish their people is to grow more food themselves rather than rely on cheap imports. The backlash may sink global trade talks, reduce the almost $1 trillion in annual food trade and lead to the return of high agricultural tariffs and subsidies around the world.¶ ``Trade as the route to food security, that idea is on the ropes,'' said [Arvind Subramanian](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Arvind+Subramanian&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1), a [senior fellow](http://www.petersoninstitute.org/staff/author_bio.cfm?author_id=488" \t "_blank) at the [Peterson Institute for International Economics](http://petersoninstitute.org/" \t "_blank) in Washington. ``If the guy who is selling it doesn't want to sell it overseas, then the guy at the other end is terribly exposed.''¶ In dozens of interviews and speeches at the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization's Rome [conference](http://www.fao.org/foodclimate/hlc-home/en/" \t "_blank) on the food crisis this month, officials from developing countries, farmers and leaders of non-governmental organizations said food self-sufficiency is the new goal for many poor nations.¶ Grain exporters such as Argentina and Vietnam have restricted shipments, driving global prices higher and leaving nations that depend on imports searching for adequate supplies.¶ Worldwide Search¶ ``The idea of trade liberalization was that you could count on global markets, but they're not proving reliable,'' said David Orden, a fellow at the [International Food Policy Research Institute](http://ifpri.org/" \t "_blank) in Washington.¶ The Philippines has embarked on a worldwide search for additional food supplies to build stockpiles and ensure it can feed its people amid record prices. The surging costs of rice, other [grains](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=FAOFCER:IND) and fuels have stoked inflation and triggered concern of civil unrest, according to the International Monetary Fund. Philippines President [Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Gloria+Macapagal-Arroyo&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1) said her country will try to become self-sufficient in food by 2010.¶ ``For a long time, it made sense to buy food from the international market,'' said [Arthur Yap](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Arthur+Yap&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1), the Philippines Agriculture Minister, in an interview June 4 in Rome. ``The situation has changed.''¶ The rift between developing countries and wealthy nations on food trade was apparent at the Rome conference. The U.S., the European Union and the World Bank all pushed for a new global trade agreement to cut subsidies and import duties in countries such as India and South Africa.¶ Latest Talks¶ The latest round of World Trade Organization negotiations was launched in 2001 in [Doha](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dda_e.htm" \t "_blank), Qatar. The goal was to cut subsidies in rich nations and tariffs in poor nations, allowing the most efficient producers -- be they in Iowa or Cordoba, Argentina -- to sell to the world. Supporters say the economic rationale still holds.¶ ``The reason why getting a Doha Round done is important is it'll end up reducing the cost of food, importing food,'' Bush said at the White House on May 1.¶ The U.S. and Europe continue to subsidize production of grains and other commodities, enabling their farmers to undercut the prices of competitors in developing countries.¶ Zoellick, Bush's former top trade adviser, [said this month in Rome](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/foodclimate/statements/wb_zoellick.pdf" \t "_blank) that one key to long-term food security is ``closing the Doha WTO deal, phasing out huge distortions from subsidies and tariffs.''

#### Protectionism directly increases food prices- only free trade lowers prices

[Caroline Boin](http://policynetwork.net/individual/caroline-boin) [International Policy Network, non profit organization who writes about global trade and trade policy, tariffs, and protectionism] 2011¶ “Rising food prices, protectionism and the poor”¶ <http://policynetwork.net/trade/media/rising-food-prices-protectionism-and-poor>

Food prices have drastically risen over the past year, causing street protests from Mexico to India to Senegal; it is the poorest countries that will benefit most from dropping their own tariffs in response to this.¶ Rising food prices have caused street protests from Mexico to India to Senegal. But this could be a blessing in disguise if it makes governments eliminate the trade barriers that push prices higher: the poorest countries will benefit most from dropping their own tariffs.¶ Nobel economics laureate Gary Becker estimates that a 30% rise in food prices over five years would cause living standards to fall by 3% in rich countries and by more than 20% in poor countries.¶ A few countries have already temporarily eased tariffs on agricultural imports to soften the blow for consumers ó even the European Union. Thailand is considering a cut of 50% for maize, soybeans and other animal feed. These tariff reductions will offset price increases not just by lowering prices but by increasing supply. Increased trade in agricultural goods (not just food) could even help avert famines where produce is subject to government control, such as in North Korea, Ethiopia and Kenya.¶ But many countries resist free trade in food, domestically or with neighbours.¶ In Africa, 200-million people are underfed, according to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation. They have borne the brunt of counterproductive state management of agriculture that has damaged farmers and economies.¶ For years, governments in Africa forced farmers to surrender their crops to state-run marketing boards at below market rates. Some of these corrupt and inefficient institutions have been weakened or abolished but many other restrictions on agriculture remain, including tariffs on produce and on inputs such as fertiliser and machinery ó and even tariffs on exports.¶ Many development analysts are obsessed with subsidies to farmers in rich countries, now extended to biofuels, and the damage it inflicts on the world's poor. But it is the world's poorest countries that impose the highest barriers against trade with each other: agricultural exports between sub-Saharan countries face an average tariff of 33,6%, the highest of any region on Earth.¶ A whopping 70% of the world's trade barriers are imposed by governments in poor countries on people in other poor countries. Alhaji Ahmed Abdulkadir, a presidential adviser in Nigeria, has said: 'I can assure you that my pen is always ready to ban more items as long as they are available in Nigeria.' These would be 'either banned completely and where we have doubts, we will impose high tariffs'. Nigeria's import bans have included staples such as wheat, rice, maize and vegetable oil, making Nigerians pay sky high prices.¶ The World Bank estimates that global free trade in all goods would add $287bn to world income each year, half of that going to poor countries. Sixty-three percent of that immediate gain would come from freeing agricultural trade alone. In African countries, nearly all of that 63% would come from removing their own import tariffs and quotas, which artificially restrict access to other markets, including their neighbours'.¶ High food prices are now a clear and immediate reason to cut tariffs, but that does not mean it will happen. For decades, protectionism has been imposed against the interests of local consumers because of an unholy coalition of Western activists and local vested interests.

## Hegemony Good

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade is key to trade and investment which are necessary to rejuvenate American leadership

Solis and Vaisse 2013 (1-17-13, “Free Trade Game Changer,” Mireya Solís is the Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies and senior fellow at the Brookings Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, and associate professor at American University, Justin Vaïsse became the director of the policy planning staff in the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/free-trade-game-changer>)

Free trade was not a priority in your first administration. It is, however, an indispensable component of a long-term growth strategy to rebound from the 2008-2012 recession. It is also a necessary part of the response to the significant redistribution of power in the international system. The pivot to Asia and to the emerging world in general cannot be based on political and military initiatives alone. It needs to be backed by rejuvenated American leadership in trade and investment.

#### Loss of American power projection capacity causes global war.

Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth ’13 (Stephen, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College “Don’t Come Home America: The Case Against Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Winter 2012/13), pp. 7–51)

A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war. 72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions. 73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays. 74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States. 75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives. 76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case. 77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces. 78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem. 79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferation changes as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows. 80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.” 81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.” 82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing. 83 In sum, the argument that U.S. security commitments are unnecessary for peace is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difªcult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States. 84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking. 85

### Hegemony Good – Exts

#### Free Trade key for US leadership- fosters global democracy and peace

**Riley and Kim,** Jay Van Andel Senior Policy Analyst in Trade Policy and Senior Policy Analyst, Economic Freedom, **2013**

(Bryan and Anthony, “Advancing Trade Freedom: Key Objective of Trade Promotion Authority Renewal”, Heritage, April 16, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) has been a critical tool for advancing free trade and spreading its benefits to a greater number of Americans. TPA, also known as “fast track” authority, is the legislative power Congress grants to the President to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements. Provided the President observes certain statutory obligations under TPA, Congress agrees to consider implementing those trade pacts without amending them.More than a decade has passed since TPA was last renewed in 2002, and its authority expired in 2007. Reinstituting TPA may well be the most important legislative action on trade for both Congress and the President in 2013 given the urgency of restoring America’s credibility in advancing open markets and securing greater benefits of two-way trade for Americans. As the case for timely reinstallation of an effective and practical TPA is stronger than ever, the quest for renewing TPA should be guided by principles that enhance trade freedom, a vital component of America’s economic freedom.Both House Ways and Means Committee chairman David Camp (R–MI) and Senate Finance Committee chairman Max Baucus (D–MT) have announced plans to pursue TPA legislation. However, many lawmakers have correctly pointed out that a proactive push from President Obama is critical, given that trade bills have been a thorny issue for many Democrats in recent years.Historically, it has been common practice, although not formally required, to have the President request that Congress provide renewed TPA. In fact, except for President Obama, every President since Franklin Roosevelt has either requested or received trade negotiating authority.[[1]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal" \l "_edn1)After four years of informing Congress it would seek TPA at “the appropriate time,” early this year the Obama Administration finally indicated its interest in working with Congress to get TPA done. The President’s 2013 trade agenda offered the Administration’s most forward-leaning language yet, specifying that “to facilitate the conclusion, approval, and implementation of market-opening negotiating efforts, we will also work with Congress on Trade Promotion Authority.”[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal" \l "_edn2)In the 2002 Bipartisan Trade Promotion Authority Act, Congress—whose role in formulating U.S. trade policy includes defining trade negotiation objectives—made it clear that[t]he expansion of international trade is vital to the national security of the United States. Trade is critical to the economic growth and strength of the United States and to its leadership in the world. Stable trading relationships promote security and prosperity.… Leadership by the United States in international trade fosters open markets, democracy, and peace throughout the world.[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal" \l "_edn3)The Obama Administration often seems to regard trade as a zero-sum game of capturing value that would otherwise go elsewhere. However, trade liberalization is about creating and adding value, capitalizing on competitive advantages, and further harnessing the power of freedom and choice. Trade has been an integral part of America’s extraordinary economic progress over the past decades. Since 1929, trade volume has increased from less than 9 percent of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) to around 30 percent, while real U.S. GDP per person increased from $8,000 to more than $43,000.This progress faces continuing threats, mainly from special-interest groups that malign free trade in an attempt to seek protection from competition at the expense of everyone else. Some lawmakers have even viewed TPA legislation as a vehicle to address the perceived costs of free trade for the U.S. economy. However, using TPA renewal to redress the suspected costs of trade is an ill-advised idea.TPA is an instrument that not only enables America to secure increased access to overseas markets but also provides the unique opportunity for the U.S. to reduce its own barriers and advance economic freedom. Congress and the President can help the American economy by removing barriers that limit its competitiveness. With open trade and investment ensured, the interplay of low tax rates and efficient regulations could effectively enhance America’s economic freedom. Entangling TPA with a protectionist agenda, on the other hand, would not serve America’s interests in the global market.

#### Trade key for economic efficiency- promotes US leadership for hard and soft power

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

In the aftermath of the horrific terrorist attacks of 9/11, however, the liberal theory suddenly gained considerable preeminence. It dawn on policy-makers that part of the problem lied in the general sense of despair in the Arab world that proved to be a breeding ground for the recruitment by terrorist organizations. Robert Zoellick, former head of the World Bank, wrote an opinion piece titled “Countering terror with trade” illustrating that new mindset: “Economic strength — at home and abroad — is the foundation of America’s hard and soft power. Earlier enemies learned that America is the arsenal of democracy; today’s enemies will learn that America is the economic engine for freedom, opportunity and development. To that end, U.S. leadership in promoting the international economic and trading system is vital. Trade is about more than economic efficiency. It promotes the values at the heart of this protracted struggle” (*Washington Post*, 2001).
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#### Free Trade create freedom and access to goods

**Lindsey**, senior fellow at the CATO institute and director of its Center for Trade Policy Studies, **2012**

(Brink, “Free Trade Nationalism”, CATO institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/free-trade-nationalism>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

If free trade is to remain a viable conservative cause, it must be disentangled from its associations with internationalist altruism. Globalization must be distinguished from globalism. To that end, conservative free traders should urge the elimination of U.S. trade barriers as a matter of domestic economic policy — outside the context of any international negotiations and regardless of what other countries choose to do. The case for free trade should be mounted squarely on grounds of the U.S. national economic interest. Although six decades of contrary practice have muddled the issue, free trade is not fundamentally about international agreements or international institutions. And it certainly has nothing to do with IMF bailouts or UN mission-creep. Rather, free trade is about freedom — freedom to trade, freedom to choose, freedom from import taxes and government regulation, freedom from subsidizing special interests. Modern conservatism has stood generally for the principle that America’s national economic interest lies in greater freedom. A campaign for unilateral trade liberalization would allow conservatives to restore that principle’s proper application to trade policy. Such a campaign would have no shortage of inviting targets: high tariffs and restrictive quotas on food and clothing, the anti-competitive antidumping law, the Jones Act ban on foreign shipping between U.S. ports, and foreign ownership limits on airlines and broadcasting, to name a few. These trade barriers punish American businesses and consumers; they restrict choices and drive up prices; they blunt the forces of competition that promote improved productivity and rising standards of living. They are a tax on American economic health for the benefit of narrow interests that cannot possibly justify their special immunity from market discipline. The fact that other countries have similar policies or worse is no reason for us to cling to our own folly. We don’t need fast track or the WTO to pursue free trade here at home. We don’t need to make excuses for imperfect trade agreements. We don’t need to play down obnoxious practices in the countries with which we sign deals. We don’t need to answer charges about the loss of sovereignty to faceless international bureaucrats. All we need is to sound the traditional conservative themes of lower taxes and less government.

#### Ethical imperative to reject starvation

**Andre and Velasquez 92** (Claire and Manuel, “World Hunger: A Moral Response,” Santa Clara University, Spring 1992, [http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v5n``1/hunger.html](http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v5n1/hunger.html), 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Giving aid to the poor in other nations may require some inconvenience or some sacrifice of luxury on the part of peoples of rich nations, but to ignore the plight of starving people is as morally reprehensible as failing to save a child drowning in a pool because of the inconvenience of getting one's clothes wet. In fact, according to Singer, allowing a person to die from hunger when it is easily within one's means to prevent it is no different, morally speaking, from killing another human being. If I purchase a VCR or spend money I don't need, knowing that I could instead have given my money to some relief agency that could have prevented some deaths from starvation, I am morally responsible for those deaths. The objection that I didn't intend for anyone to die is irrelevant. If I speed though an intersection and, as a result, kill a pedestrian, I am morally responsible for that death whether I intended it or not. In making a case for aid to poor nations, others appeal to the principle of justice. Justice demands that people be compensated for the harms and injustices suffered at the hands of others. Much of the poverty of developing nations, they argue, is the result of unjust and exploitative policies of governments and corporations in wealthy countries. The protectionist trade policies of rich nations, for example, have driven down the price of exports of poor nations. According to one report, the European Economic Community imposes a tariff four times as high against cloth imported from poor nations as from rich ones. Such trade barriers cost developing countries $50 to $100 billion a year in lost sales and depressed markets. Moreover, the massive debt burdens consuming the resources of poor nations is the result of the tight monetary policies adopted by developed nations which drove up interest rates on the loans that had been made to these countries. In 1989, Third World countries owed $1.2 trillion nearly half of their total CNP to banks and governments in industrial countries. According to one report, since 1988, $50 billion a year has been transferred from poor nations to rich nations to service these debts.

### Living Standards / Access to Goods Exts

#### Free Trade is good- allows for better trade policy and living standards

**Sorcher**, Labor Representative and Society for Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace, **2013**

(Stan, “So-Called Free Trade – Bad Policy and Wrong Deabte”, Huffington Post, June 18, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stan-sorscher/free-trade-bad-policy-wro_b_1600688.html>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

An editorial in my local paper is a good example of how we trivialize our public discussion of globalization and trade policy. The editorial follows this logic: Trade is good. All trade is good. More trade is better than less trade. Maximum possible trade! Anyone who disagrees is protectionist or resentful. I can immediately correct one misunderstanding. Everyone I know is in favor of trade. I am 100 percent in favor of trade. The issue is not "trade." The issue is good trade policy, which raises my standard of living, or bad trade policy, which lowers it. Similarly, I am in favor of capitalism. Even so, we can have real, significant, meaningful, legitimate debates about good rules for capitalism and bad rules for capitalism. I am in favor of banks. We deserve serious policy debates about banking.I am 100 percent in favor manufacturing. China's manufacturing capacity is prodigious. It grows on the misguided principle of maximum possible output. As a result, air pollution in China is legendary, causing 750,000 premature deaths per year. In America, we debated clean air and clean water. Our public health and living standards are better for that debate. I am in favor of copper, iron ore and titanium. However, it is bad trade policy for international trade tribunals to compel El Salvador to expose their people to unsafe mining practices, threatening more than a third of their clean water. Maximum possible mining threatens public health and safety in El Salvador.It is bad public policy for a trade tribunal to overturn Ecuador's $18 billion environmental penalties against Chevron, compelling the national courts to back down in the face of trade sanctions. Chevron has already damaged the environment, and been found guilty in court. Bad trade policy punishes Ecuador instead of Chevron.These concerns are not new. Past trade negotiations identified them in writing, but dealt with them ineffectually.

#### Free Trade decreases wealth imbalance

**Riley and Miller 2010**

(Bryan and Terry, a Jay Van Andel Senior Policy Analyst in Trade Policy at The Heritage Foundation and a Director, Center for International Trade and Economics and the Mark A. Kolokotrones Fellow in Economic Freedom, “Free Trade Fights Wealth Concentration,” The Heritage Foundation, 11-20-10, 7-5-13, http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2010/10/free-trade-fights-wealth-concentration)//KC

When President Obama was still candidate Obama, he traveled to Berlin to share his foreign-policy views with Europeans. "Trade," he told them, "has been a cornerstone of our growth and global development." "But," he added, "we will not be able to sustain this growth if it favors the few and not the many." Good news, Mr. President. It turns out that trade does benefit the many. A new study of global trade policy and economics from the Heritage Foundation shows that free-trading countries enjoy the strongest economies. Even better, the resulting prosperity is more widely shared in those countries than in countries with large barriers to free trade. Put simply, there is more wealth — and less income disparity — in free-trading nations than in protectionist nations. Heritage's Index of Trade Freedom rates countries on a 1-to-100 scale on the extent to which their laws and policies encourage free trade with other nations. In general, 80 is a good score in terms of trade freedom; 72 or less is bad. Heritage then compares those scores to the World Bank's wealth-concentration index. The researchers found that the 10 countries with the highest concentration of income in the hands of the richest 10 percent earned an average trade-freedom score of 70.2. The 10 nations with the least concentration of income averaged a trade freedom score of 84.1 — more than 20 percent higher. The numbers indicate that nations truly interested in "spreading the wealth" should reject protectionism and embrace free-trade policies. Free trade is an effective way to boost overall prosperity as well. The world's 10 poorest countries averaged 64.5 on the Heritage free-trade scale. The 10 with the highest per capita gross domestic product, or GDP, averaged 87. These findings are hugely important, especially now, when free trade is under attack in a way not seen in decades. More Americans than ever work in import-export-related jobs, yet polls indicate the percentage of Americans who say free trade is good for the economy fell from 78 percent in 2002 to 59 percent in 2007. Skepticism as to the benefits of free trade has grown among all income and age groups. This trend may well accelerate as people get increasingly nervous about rising foreign investment in the U.S. from China and other sovereign wealth funds. Voters and policymakers alike expressed outrage when the Chinese energy firm CNOOC tried to purchase the U.S.-based Unocal and reacted similarly when DP World tried to purchase operations at six U.S. ports.

## Terrorism
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#### Trade counter terror- post 9/11 proves

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

In the aftermath of the horrific terrorist attacks of 9/11, however, the liberal theory suddenly gained considerable preeminence. It dawn on policy-makers that part of the problem lied in the general sense of despair in the Arab world that proved to be a breeding ground for the recruitment by terrorist organizations. Robert Zoellick, former head of the World Bank, wrote an opinion piece titled “Countering terror with trade” illustrating that new mindset: “Economic strength — at home and abroad — is the foundation of America’s hard and soft power. Earlier enemies learned that America is the arsenal of democracy; today’s enemies will learn that America is the economic engine for freedom, opportunity and development. To that end, U.S. leadership in promoting the international economic and trading system is vital. Trade is about more than economic efficiency. It promotes the values at the heart of this protracted struggle” (*Washington Post*, 2001).

#### Nuclear terrorism escalates to major nuclear war

Ayson’10

Robert – Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington – “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, obtained via InformaWorld

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves. But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks, FN 40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide.There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint. FN 40. One way of reducing, but probably not eliminating, such a prospect, is further international cooperation on the control of existing fissile material holdings.

### Terrorism Exts

#### Trade key economic opportunities- a way to fight terrorism

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Economic growth in the Arab world thus became a matter of strategic importance and trade, a weapon of choice to fight terrorism for the United States (Looney, 2005). According to that line of thought, the path to ensuring American security has to go through the creation of better social and economic opportunities in the Arab world. This entails “policies that encourage domestic and Foreign Direct Investment, (…) a competitive private sector and strong trade relations with the West” (Dadush & Dunne, 2011: 143). More specifically, without a strong private sector, one cannot solve the issue of rampant unemployment in the region. Trade agreements are thought to tackle this issue as they provide local private actors with funds to undertake their projects through FDI. In addition, exposition to the international market is thought to encourage competition and productivity in local markets. Local actors will have to align with international trade rules, thus pushing for local reforms and improving the local business climate. The result, the thinking goes, is the creation of a virtuous circle of growth. In the last stage of this development, the pressure to reform will translate politically into the creation of a democracy (Dadush & Dunne, 2011: 135; Nasr 2009). In sum, free trade will soak up unemployment, generate economic growth and by way of consequence, it will diminish social instability and create the conditions for a democratic and stable Middle East.

#### Trade cost effective way to fight terrorism

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Lastly it is often argued that trade -contrary to foreign aid- encourages constructive development and sets developing countries on the path of economic independence. Trade is also believed to be a cost-effective and less invasive way of fighting social instability and terrorism, contrary to military intervention, which tends to antagonize the local population.  The enduring difficulties of the military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq have taught the USA the hard way to favor less intrusive means to defend national interests. Trade seems to be answer to that tall order.

#### Liberal commerce through trade pacifies confrontation- diminishes a chance of terrorism attack

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

“Commerce first taught nations to see with good will the wealth and prosperity of one another.” – John Stuart Mill, The Principle of Political Economy. For Mill, there is no doubt that trade has the ability to pacify relations between states. David Hume, Adam Smith and Emmanuel Kant are other famous classical political theorist who extolled the virtues of commerce in fostering understanding and cooperation between nations. Their writings built the foundations for the liberal tradition in international relations that regards trade and commerce as the pre-requisite to the pacification between states. Commerce, the thinking goes, enables countries to gain financially from their cooperation through mutually beneficial exchanges, thus diminishing the risks of confrontation. Through comparative advantage, each country is able to develop a specific product at a lower cost, making it profitable for every country to trade with one another (David Ricardo, 1817) Taking their cues from these liberal theorists, US policy-makers found trade to be a weapon of choice to fight terrorism, especially in the aftermath of 9/11. Foreign aid and military intervention were thought to be inefficient at best and detrimental to US interests at worst. Free trade agreements with Arab countries were thought to be the panacea for the region’s economic problems by generating economic growth and diminishing unemployment and social poverty, which are both believed to be conducive factors for instability and terrorism. However, in the wake of the Arab uprisings – which were mostly motivated by the lack of freedom and economic opportunities – one must ask whether trade is really the key to fighting terrorism.

## Economy

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free Trade key to the economy – employment and growth

Foulkes 2012 (“The Magic of Free Trade,” 10-22-12, <http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/the-magic-of-free-trade#axzz2YCcbjJVp>, SP)

Free trade truly is needed for an economy to grow and prosper. According to the 2012 Index of Economic Freedom published by the Heritage Foundation and The Wall Street Journal, countries with the most trade freedom (such as Hong Kong, Switzerland, and Canada) have higher per capita GDPs, lower incidences of hunger, lower rates of unemployment, and cleaner environments than countries at the bottom of the trade freedom scale, such as North Korea, Bangladesh, and Zimbabwe. And countries that tried for decades to be self-sufficient, such as India, paid a heavy price in stagnant growth and poverty.

#### Economic conflicts cause extinction

Daguzan 2010 (Citing Jean Francois, PhD and Senior Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, "Economic crisis threatens existence of human beings" November 26, 2010, Right Vision News, pg online @ lexisnexis)

The financial and economic crisis being faced by the world is in fact a human catastrophe as it may threatenthe well-being and existence of human beings in the globe, said Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan, senior research fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, France.¶ ¶ He was speaking at a roundtable discussion on ‘The Strategic Consequences of World Financial and Economic Crisis’ organised by the South Asia Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI) here on Wednesday. Former ambassador Tasawur Naqvi conducted the proceedings.¶ ¶ Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan said that the crisis could lead to violence. Every effort should be made to control it as it may lead to risky and dangerous situations. He said that the balance of power had already changed.¶ ¶ He said that if economic crisis is compared with 9/11 and invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, the World Trade Centre debacle seemed to be a contingent affair. The financial crisis to him was like a nuclear war, which is tilting the balance of power in the world. He said that an amount of $50,000 billion went to the aid of developing nations. He noted the impact of the snowballing crisis on stock exchanges and investment potential of different countries. He said that the crisis also affected stability of nations by impacting equities and stock exchanges.¶ ¶ He said that the war in currencies is the last impact of the crisis in an age of artificial monetary powers of currencies, which would provoke and continue with economic crises within countries. He said that it is rebalancing the power politics in the world. He enumerated Southeast Asia’s economies facing problems in 1988 when China was big, but not enough to become the lone competitor of the west.

### Economy Exts

#### Job growth is key to the economy- free trade agreements help spur jobs

Frank Lucas [writing for [Enid News and Eagle](http://enidnews.com/)]¶ June 26, 2011¶ [Job creation is key to restoring economy](http://enidnews.com/opinion/x927317616/Job-creation-is-key-to-restoring-economy)¶ <http://enidnews.com/opinion/x927317616/Job-creation-is-key-to-restoring-economy>

It is no secret that trillions in spending and an increase in government red tape have caused many Americans to lose their jobs and resulted in a sluggish economy. More than 13.9 million Americans were unable to find work in May. Some have been seeking employment for months, but are starting to give up hope. From visiting with my constituents of Oklahoma’s Third Congressional District and listening to their concerns, I know something must be done to increase the number of jobs and get the economy back on track. Recently, the House Republican Plan for America’s Job Creators was unveiled to combat these issues. This plan will provide more economic certainty for families, small businesses and entrepreneurs. The first step to economic success and creating jobs is enacting changes to the tax code that will make the system fairer, simpler and more efficient for all Americans. For example, reducing the overall tax rate to 25 percent or less for small and large businesses and individuals will generate economic expansion while in turn creating more jobs and making America more competitive. In addition to tax reforms, free trade agreements need to be passed with Columbia, Panama and South Korea. Passing these agreements will increase the number of exports, which will increase the amount of production. More production of these goods will require more workers, and this will create hundreds of thousands of jobs.

#### Free trade boosts US GDP, firms and econ development

Melitz & Trefler, Wells Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University and economics professor at the University of Toronto, 2013, Marc & Daniel, “Gains from Trade when Firms Matter”, American Economic Association, Spring 2012, Jstor, 7/5/13, JG

A substantial portion of the increased trade that comes with economic integration also delivers increased product variety to consumers. Balistreri, Hilberrry, and Rutherford (2011) show that the worldwide elimination of all trade barriers would raise the number of varieties available by about 3 percent, lower manufacturing prices by a similar amount, and raise world welfare by 2 percent. Most of these gains would accrue to developing countries such as China. Broda and Weinstein (2006) estimate that the number of products available to U.S. consumers through imports tripled between 1972 and 2001, resulting in welfare gains to U.S. consumers equivalent to a 2.6 percent rise in U.S. GDP. Feenstra (2010, table 2.1) examines how worldwide welfare would change if all countries went from autarky to their 1996 levels of trade. He estimates that the welfare gains from increased varieties are comparable to a 12.5 percent rise in world GDP. While the exact magnitudes of the gains from increased variety differ across studies due to differences in what exactly is being modeled, the clear message is that the gains have been very large for developed countries and continue to be large for developing countries. Trade expands product variety both in final goods (which benefits consumers) as well as in specialized production inputs (which benefits the firms that use those inputs). Ethier (1982) showed that there is a close parallel between these two. Instead of the love-of-variety that accrues to consumers, firms benefit from the increased productivity derived from an increased range of available production inputs. Recent firm-level research has confirmed this product variety benefit for firms that import intermediate inputs. Using Hungarian data, Halpern, Koren, and Szeidl (2005) show that importing many varieties of foreign inputs increases firm productivity by 12 percent. Using Indonesian data, Amiti and Konings (2007) show that a 10 percentage point fall in input tariffs leads to a productivity gain of 12 percent for firms that import their inputs. Kasahara and Rodrigue (2008), Kasahara and Lapham (2012), Topalova and Khandelwal (2011), and Goldberg, Khandelwal, Pavcnik, and Topalova (2010) show similarly large gains for Chile and India. In the context of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, Lileeva and Trefler (2010) find that the fall in Canadian tariffs on inputs that Canadian firms purchased from the United States resulted in a 0.5 percent rise in Canadian manufacturing productivity. The Canadian impacts are not nearly as large as effects from developing countries, which suggests that access to a variety of inputs is an important ingredient in the process of economic development.

#### FT increases global GDP by trillions perpetuating economic development

Lomborg, Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, 2013, Bjørn, “How Free Trade Might Be the World's Best Option”, TheHuffingtonPost.com, June 6th 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bjorn-lomborg/free-trade-g8_b_3450229.html>, 7/5/13, JG

British Prime Minister David Cameron has rightly put free trade on the top of the G8 agenda. It is possibly one of the best ways we could help the world foster economic prosperity and development.¶ Cameron writes that comprehensive free trade "could boost the income of the whole world by more than $1 trillion." As it turns out, this is likely a serious understatement.¶ The classic argument for free trade points out that specialization and exchange benefits everyone, because goods are produced by the countries that specialize in those goods and produce them most efficiently. The standard World Bank models show that realistic free trade, even just by the end of this decade would increase global GDP by several hundred billion dollars per year, with perhaps $50 billion accruing to the developing countries. Towards the end of the century, the annual benefit will likely exceed Cameron's $1 trillion annually, with half going to the developing world.¶ But a growing number of academic studies now show that the free trade story goes much further than simple specialization. History shows that open economies grow faster. Good examples include Korea from 1965, Chile from 1974 and India from 1991, which all saw their growth rates increase significantly after liberalization. Even modestly freer trade helps domestic markets become more efficient and get supply chains better integrated. At the same time trade transfers knowledge, which spurs innovation. Free trade means we don't all have to reinvent the wheel over and over again.¶ This is perhaps best captured in a recent state-of-the-art literature review by Professor Kym Anderson for the Copenhagen Consensus think tank. Anderson, one of the World Bank's lead modelers, shows that the long-run benefits from even a modestly successful Doha free trade round would be vast. The annual GDP compared to no extra free trade would in 2020 be about $5 trillion larger, with $3 trillion going to the developing world. Towards the end of the century, slightly higher growth rates will have accumulated to benefits exceeding $100 trillion annually, with most going to the developing world. By then, benefits would add about 20 percent annually to developing world GDP.¶ It is hard to imagine any other policy that the leaders of G8 could advocate that would generate more prosperity and development in the world. Recall the UK's last G8 summit where Tony Blair promised to fight global warming. Even if the G8 leaders had been successful -- which they predictably were not -- economic models show that they could perhaps have avoided a fraction of one percent of GDP damages towards the end of the century. An outcome orders of magnitude less beneficial, much less achievable and likely with an astonishingly higher price tag.

FT Benefits US Economy - Creates service trade surplus, increase trade, creates jobs (NAFTA)

Frickel et al, Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Nebraska at Kearney, 2011, Beverly, “The Effect Of NAFTA On Trade And Investment Between Member Countries”, The International Business & Economics Research Journal, June 2011, Proquest, 7/8/13, JG

Trade records show that member countries have benefited from the agreement. The Office of the United States Trade Representative reports a 198 percent increase in trade among the three countries between 1993 and 2006. US exports to Canada and Mexico increased by 157 percent compared to an increase of 103 percent to the rest of the world. In 2008, although the U.S. had a goods trade deficit ($75 billion) with its two land neighbors, it had a services trade surplus ($29.6 billion) with them (USTR.GOVa). Because of the large trade within the region, Canada and Mexico are among the top three U.S. (world's largest economy) trading partners. Economic reforms in Mexico have been kept on track by NAFTA. Foreign equity has led to higher productivity (Kessel and Kim, 1995). Foreign direct investment (FDI), which used to focus on high-tech, has expanded to include transport, machinery, and metals (Morales, 1999). The abundance of cheap labor in Mexico is an attraction to U.S. firms. This is responsible for 49 percent of the value-added created by in-bond industries in Mexico (INEGI, 1998). As a result, one of the benefits of NAFTA to Mexico is job creation. In 1993, Mexico-U.S. trade created 29,385 jobs in the U.S., but in 2004, 559,564 jobs were displaced in the U.S. (Scott et al, 2006).

#### **FT – Creates significant bilateral trade increases and trade exports for all members**

Park, Economics and Research Department, 2010, “Effects of Hub-and-Spoke Free Trade Agreements on Trade: A Panel Data Analysis”, World Development, 2010, <https://asab.nottingham.ac.uk/gep/documents/conferences/2010/malaysia-conference-2010/hur-alba-park.pdf>, 7/8/13, JG

Our point of departure is an¶ increasingly prominent stylized fact of international trade in the real world, namely¶ the overlapping of free trade agreements (FTAs) which give rise to hub-and-spoke¶ FTAs. Intuitively, an FTA hub which belongs to two FTAs – Y and Z – enjoy a¶ 19¶ competitive advantage in exporting its goods vis-à-vis FTA spokes which belong to¶ only one of the two FTAs. The hub has a price advantage vis-à-vis Y-only countries in the Z market and price advantage vis-à-vis Z-only countries in the Y market. To the¶ extent that this advantage results in higher exports and hence trade, we can expect the¶ hub-and-spoke feature of overlapping FTAs to increase trade above and beyond the¶ direct, trade liberalizing effect of FTAs. For example, as explained in the Appendix,¶ when there is no trade diversion this additional positive impact of FTA hub position¶ on trade becomes clear.Indeed one of our two main empirical findings is that the hub and spoke nature of¶ FTAs in a world of overlapping FTAs does have a positive and significant effect on¶ bilateral trade among FTA members. More precisely, our results imply an average¶ annual growth rate of trade of 5.57% between FTA members and hence a doubling of¶ bilateral trade after 12.4 years. Out of the 5.57%, if we hold constant the FTA-hub¶ effect on trade, the estimated growth rate of trade was only 4.13%. This implies that¶ some governments pursue multiple FTAs so as to achieve or reinforce their FTA-hub¶ status. Our evidence indicates that countries which are FTA hubs are able to export¶ more than other countries, giving countries a strong incentive to become FTA hubs.¶ Our results thus help to explain an interesting stylized fact of global trade –¶ proliferation of regional trade agreements and overlapping of free trade agreements.

#### Free Trade key to the economy- imports create jobs

**Riley and Kim,** Jay Van Andel Senior Policy Analyst in Trade Policy and Senior Policy Analyst, Economic Freedom, **2013**

(Bryan and Anthony, “Advancing Trade Freedom: Key Objective of Trade Promotion Authority Renewal”, Heritage, April 16, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

The TPA renewal debate in Congress should reflect the fact that both exports and imports are job-supporting activities. In other words, the debate should focus on how to deliver greater trade freedom to Americans that advances the benefits of trade in both directions.It is a common misperception that importing goods to America comes at the cost of American jobs. In fact, imports contribute to job creation on a large scale. The increased economic activity associated with every stage of the import process helps support millions of jobs in the U.S. As shown by a recent Heritage Foundation study, for instance, over half a million American jobs—in fields such as transportation, wholesale, retail, construction, and finance—are supported by imports of clothes and toys from China alone.[[4]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal" \l "_edn4)Highlighting the dynamic and value-adding role played by imports in the U.S. economy, an empirical analysis published in the *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review* presents strong evidence that “policies to bolster exports at the expense of imports would significantly harm U.S. manufacturing,” adding that “imports have played a critical positive role in boosting manufacturing output in the United States—much more so, in fact, than exports.”[[5]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal" \l "_edn5) Indeed, intermediate goods imports and capital goods imports are the lifeblood of U.S. manufacturing. Without them, manufacturing output is impossible.

**Congress should not let opportunity pass- free trade creates economic freedom**

**Riley and Kim,** Jay Van Andel Senior Policy Analyst in Trade Policy and Senior Policy Analyst, Economic Freedom, **2013**

(Bryan and Anthony, “Advancing Trade Freedom: Key Objective of Trade Promotion Authority Renewal”, Heritage, April 16, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

While working constructively with the Obama Administration, Congress should:

Grant long-term (at least five years or even permanent) renewal of TPA so that America’s credibility in pursuing free trade can be effectively restored;Insist on negotiating parameters that promote actual increases in international trade flows and guarantee reductions in tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade and investment;

Oppose any emphasis in TPA legislation on the promotion of exports over imports in recognition of the importance of both in increasing American jobs and prosperity; andResist imposing any special sectoral or industry-specific requirements on negotiators, including in areas such as environmental and labor standards.The threat to U.S. prosperity comes not from free trade but from the decline in economic freedom. In the process of working on TPA reauthorization, Congress has the unique opportunity to become an effective advocate for advancing economic freedom and help America reap the rewards that accrue from such policies. It should not let the opportunity pass.

## Trade Wars

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Protectionism causes nuclear trade war and turns case

Panzner 8, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase (Michael, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138, googlebooks)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster, But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange, foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the (heap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more healed sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an "intense confrontation" between the United States and China is "inevitable" at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

### Trade Wars Exts

#### Regional Trade Alliances reduce the risk of war

**Vicard 2012**

(Vincent, economist at Banque de France since 2009, “Trade, conflict, and political integration: Explaining the heterogeneity of regional trade agreements,” Banque de France, January 2012, Science Direct, 7-5-13, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0014292111000766)//KC

The literature in international relations identifies two channels through which regional trade integration is likely to affect international insecurity (Bearce, 2003).2 First, since war disrupts bilateral trade (Martin et al., 2008 and Glick and Taylor, 2010), an RTA increases the opportunity cost of war by increasing intra-regional trade (Martin et al., 2008, Polachek, 1980 and Oneal and Russett, 1999). Second, supranational institutions created in relation to regional integration promote the exchange of information on military capabilities and resolve and patience in conflicts, through formal security/military substructures, joint military exercises and forums of defence ministers. Moreover, regular meetings of head of states and high level officials or the existence of an executive secretariat create habits of negotiation and build trust between political leaders.3 International institutions are thus likely to reduce asymmetries of information in conflicts and to mitigate problems of credible commitment in interstate negotiations, which reduces the probability that a dispute escalates into war (Fearon, 1995 and Grossman, 2004).4

## India Pakistan Conflict

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Indo/ Pak free trade increases economic interdependence and reduces the risk of war

The Diplomat [the premier international current-affairs magazine for the Asia-Pacific region]¶ [Growing India-Pakistan Trade Bodes Well for South Asia](http://thediplomat.com/the-pulse/2013/04/15/growing-india-pakistan-trade-bodes-well-for-south-asia/) ¶ April 15, 2013¶ <http://thediplomat.com/the-pulse/2013/04/15/growing-india-pakistan-trade-bodes-well-for-south-asia/>

That South Asia is one of the world’s least integrated regions has been well chronicled. Historical tensions and regional rivalries have hampered intra-regional trade, with prime responsibility lying squarely on regional heavyweights India and Pakistan, which have fought three wars since their independence from Britain in 1947.¶ Proposals for a South Asia Free Trade Agreement (SAFTA) to boost intra-regional trade from [U.S. $11 billion in 2007 to U.S. $40 billion by 2015](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOUTHASIAEXT/Resources/223546-1192413140459/4281804-1192413178157/4281806-1265938468438/BeyondSAFTAFeb2010Chapter6.pdf)seem like a pipedream. Intra-regional trade has languished for decades as only about 5 percent of the region’s total trade occurs between its nations, despite their geographical proximity and shared history. This contrasts with [intra-regional trade in Africa and East Asia](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/c3331146-80ef-11e0-8351-00144feabdc0.html) where the corresponding figures are 15 percent and 50 percent, respectively.¶ However, the latest trade figures indicate that two-way trade between India and Pakistan may have turned a corner. India’s exports to Pakistan increased 15 percent between April 2012 and February 2013 to U.S. $1.6 billion, up from U.S. $1.4 billion in the corresponding period last year. Meanwhile, Indian imports from Pakistan registered a 30 percent increase from U.S. $375 million to U.S. $488 million during the same period.¶ According to a [report in the Indian Express](http://www.indianexpress.com/news/indiapak-trade-at-its-peak-exports-see-a-15--jump/1102584/), this expansion showed that India-Pakistan trade was approaching the levels of New Delhi’s economic relations with other neighbors, such as Sri Lanka and Bangladesh.¶ While still modest, these figures are also the highest ever between the two countries, indicating that a recent thaw in diplomatic ties between the two South Asian rivals could be bearing fruit. The thaw comes after the fledgling India-Pakistan peace process, which began in 2004, but was suspended by India in 2008 when Pakistan-based militants carried out a terror attack on India’s financial hub, Mumbai, leaving 166 people dead.¶ A slew of high-level engagements between the two sides last year brought the dialogue process back on track. In April 2012, Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari visited India on a day-long private visit during which he held talks with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh. The visit was followed by reciprocal visits by Pakistani and Indian foreign ministers in July and September, leading to the signing of a landmark visa agreement that eased travel restrictions between the two sides.¶ The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Chamber of Commerce and Industry, a regional trade body, welcomed the agreement, saying that the new liberalized visa regime would significantly boost bilateral trade.¶ Further, last year the Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP) government announced its intention to grant New Delhi’s long-standing demand for [Most Favored Nation](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2013-04-10/news/38434021_1_mfn-status-most-favoured-nation-normalise-trade-relations) (MFN) status, but has since balked on the issue amid strong opposition at home. The chances that India will be granted MFN status will likely depend on the outcome of Pakistan’s [elections in May](http://m.indianexpress.com/news/new-pak-govt-will-take-call-on-giving-india-mfn-status/1100581/).¶ Still, these tentative steps towards normalizing economic ties have wider implications for the region. For one, strengthening trade ties can help prevent deterioration in political relations between the nuclear-armed neighbors. Further, stronger economic ties can significantly increase the cost of conflict.¶ While it is too early to judge the extent of the positive influence of trade, these facts could potentially serve as catalysts for better ties between India and Pakistan, possibly paving the way for the resolution of more contentious issues such as the Kashmir dispute.

#### Indo-Pak war risks nuclear war and extinction of all life on the planet:

Jeff Duffy, 2004 last modified 9/22/2004 (accessed at: HYPERLINK "http://www.ccds.charlotte.nc.us/History/India/03/duffy/duffy.htm)

All of this strife could be multiplied tremendously with the introduction of nuclear weapons. Such weapons would drastically multiply the damage India and Pakistan could cause, and could even affect the whole world. Nuclear weapons not only kill huge masses of people in the direct area where the bombs are dropped but also pose danger to surrounding areas. From the bombs come radioactive pollution of the air and the chance of radioactive particles on the earth surface. It has been proven that even low concentrations of radioactivity endanger humans and can harm people throughout the whole world. Modern nuclear weapons can create unimaginable devastation **and could even destroy all life on earth**. One possible outcome is **nuclear winter** which is caused when multiple bombs are set off **resulting in killing all life on earth.** Since these two countries are in possession of nuclear weapons **there is a great chance that they will use them.** Unfortunately, India and Pakistan both have developed nuclear weapons.

### FT solves India-Pakistan Exts

#### Despite past failures elsewhere free trade solves conflict between India/ Pakistan

[ANUBHAV GUPTA](http://www.fletcherforum.org/author/andy-gupta/) [Fletcher School focusing on U.S. foreign policy, international security issues, and South Asia] ¶ MAY 11, 2013¶ India-Pakistan Trade: A New Hope¶ <http://www.fletcherforum.org/2013/05/11/gupta-2/>

Countries that trade with each other don’t go to war with each other. While this argument has been debunked repeatedly throughout history, many—including the U.S. government—still believe that [increasing trade between estranged neighbors and nuclear rivals India and Pakistan will reduce the likelihood of conflict](http://dawn.com/2011/11/12/india-pakistan-trade-ties-encouraging-us/). After witnessing three wars in the twentieth century, a mammoth military standoff in 2002, and countless terrorist attacks and recriminations, the world is eager to pin its hopes on anything that might cool tensions in one of its most volatile regions. Improved trade relations between India and Pakistan may in fact be the solution.¶ Following a complete breakdown in relations in the wake of the 2008 Mumbai attacks, India and Pakistan reestablished diplomatic ties in early 2011. Relations have improved rapidly ever since, as both governments engaged in diplomatic dialogue publically and behind the scenes. The greatest signs of progress came in November 2011, when Pakistan [announced it would grant Most Favored Nation (MFN) status](http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/pak-grants-mfn-status-to-india/article2591731.ece) to India, and in September 2012, when the two countries [signed a new visa agreement](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/09/world/asia/india-and-pakistan-sign-visa-agreement-easing-travel.html). Although such policy changes have yet to be implemented, the thaw in relations is historic due to its substance and the speed at which it came to fruition. But why now?¶ Détente has always been in both country’s best interests, but institutions—the military in Pakistan and electoral politics in India—have repeatedly gotten in the way of greater economic integration. But the current situation in each country has opened the door for the two to resolve some of their problems by developing trust and connections on both sides of the border as well as by having specific political constituencies push for peace. Trade combines these objectives perfectly.¶ The events of the past decade have forced politicians in both countries to think beyond competition. Pakistan has lived through a grueling ten years as its economy stagnated and its support for radical militants led to sectarian violence and terrorism at home. India, on the other hand, has seen its fortunes rise steadily because of its robust growth rates, emerging as an economic power with influence on the world stage. Graphical depictions of each country’s trajectory provide a sharp illustration of the contrast between them. To put it simply, India now has global aspirations and Pakistan has been left behind.¶ Consequently, each country’s priorities and threat perceptions have shifted. India has positively transformed its diplomatic relations with the U.S., while Pakistan’s relationship with the world’s preeminent power has deteriorated. Each governments mistrusts the other’s ambitions in Kashmir, dedicating significant military and economic resources to the border region, but Indian strategic thinkers now see China’s rise as their most pressing strategic problem. And both countries remain concerned about economic development, but only recently has Pakistan realized that continued instability is deleterious to that goal. The recent thaw in relations suggests that the two governments realize they cannot forgo stronger economic ties.¶ Estimated at just $2.6 billion in 2011, trade between India and Pakistan is atrociously low given the cultural similarities between them and the history of economic activity in the region. The figure appears even lower when compared to India’s trade with China, which [may soon surpass $100 billion](http://www.economist.com/node/21554526). Studies have projected that moving immediately to free trade between India and Pakistan could [triple the amount of commerce to as high as $8 billion](http://www.indianexpress.com/news/indiapak-bilateral-trade-seen-at--8-bn/935515/) by 2015. If restrictions are removed and trade between India and Pakistan is allowed to flourish, larger constituencies for peace would automatically develop. Thousands of workers, entrepreneurs, and companies that reap the benefits of trade would pressure politicians to maintain healthy bilateral relations. Such a constituency has already started to develop in the Punjab, where leaders of both the [Indian state](http://zeenews.india.com/news/nation/badal-demands-another-trade-route-between-india-and-pakistan_821153.html) and the adjacent [Pakistani province](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2228846/Punjabs-Sukhbir-bats-Indo-Pak-border-trade.html) of the same name have called for greater trade as the key to creating a sustainable peace.¶ Despite improved bilateral relations in the past two years, significant roadblocks persist. Politics and [unnecessary border skirmishes](http://www.economist.com/blogs/banyan/2013/01/india-and-pakistan) have interfered with progress, and major economic policy changes have repeatedly been delayed and will have to be implemented by the new civilian government that comes to power after today’s elections. Although it is widely believed that both countries are waiting for the other to make concessions, neither has been willing to take the first step thus far. [Business interests in both countries are pushing to change that](http://tribune.com.pk/story/522478/trade-ties-delegation-from-pakistan-visits-india/) and the international community should voice its support.¶ Once the Pakistani election results are in, the two governments should make trade a top priority, implementing mutual steps to maximize political cover. [Pakistan’s parliament should stop stalling](http://dawn.com/2012/12/29/mfn-status-for-india-on-backburner/) and officially approve India’s MFN status as well as the bilateral visa agreement. Meanwhile, India should take steps to simplify its trade rules and tariffs, especially on key Pakistani export industries like textiles and agriculture. In the end, bold political leadership will be necessary to jump start trade, which would have enormous economic benefits for both countries. Most importantly, the promise of a booming trade relationship could finally put a lasting peace within reach.

## Environmental Protection

### 1NC/1AC Module

Free trade creates cleaner environments

Foulkes 2012 (“The Magic of Free Trade,” 10-22-12, <http://www.fee.org/the_freeman/detail/the-magic-of-free-trade#axzz2YCcbjJVp>, SP)

Free trade truly is needed for an economy to grow and prosper. According to the 2012 Index of Economic Freedom published by the Heritage Foundation and The Wall Street Journal, countries with the most trade freedom (such as Hong Kong, Switzerland, and Canada) have higher per capita GDPs, lower incidences of hunger, lower rates of unemployment, and cleaner environments than countries at the bottom of the trade freedom scale, such as North Korea, Bangladesh, and Zimbabwe. And countries that tried for decades to be self-sufficient, such as India, paid a heavy price in stagnant growth and poverty.

#### The result of unchecked environmental destruction is extinction

Chris Hedges [Chris Hedges, whose column is published Mondays on Truthdig, spent nearly two decades as a foreign correspondent in Central America, the Middle East, Africa and the Balkans. He has reported from more than 50 countries and has worked for The Christian Science Monitor, National Public Radio, The Dallas Morning News and The New York Times, for which he was a foreign correspondent for 15 years. Hedges was part of the team of reporters at The New York Times awarded a Pulitzer Prize in 2002 for the paper’s coverage of global terrorism. He also received the Amnesty International Global Award for Human Rights Journalism in 2002]7/19/2010 (American Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, and war correspondent specializing in American and Middle Eastern politics and societies. ) "Calling All Future Eaters." http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/calling\_all\_future-eaters\_20100719/

The human species during its brief time on Earth has exhibited a remarkable capacity to kill itself off. The Cro-Magnons dispatched the gentler Neanderthals. The conquistadors, with the help of smallpox, decimated the native populations in the Americas. Modern industrial warfare in the 20th century took at least 100 million lives, most of them civilians. And now we sit passive and dumb as corporations and the leaders of industrialized nations ensure that climate change will accelerate to levels that could mean the extinction of our species. Homo sapiens, as the biologist Tim Flannery points out, are the “future-eaters.” In the past when civilizations went belly up through greed, mismanagement and the exhaustion of natural resources, human beings migrated somewhere else to pillage anew. But this time the game is over. There is nowhere else to go. The industrialized nations spent the last century seizing half the planet and dominating most of the other half. We giddily exhausted our natural capital, especially fossil fuel, to engage in an orgy of consumption and waste that poisoned the Earth and attacked the ecosystem on which human life depends. It was quite a party if you were a member of the industrialized elite. But it was pretty stupid. Collapse this time around will be global. We will disintegrate together. And there is no way out. The 10,000-year experiment of settled life is about to come to a crashing halt. And humankind, which thought it was given dominion over the Earth and all living things, will be taught a painful lesson in the necessity of balance, restraint and humility. There is no human monument or city ruin that is more than 5,000 years old. Civilization, Ronald Wright notes in “A Short History of Progress,” “occupies a mere 0.2 percent of the two and a half million years since our first ancestor sharpened a stone.” Bye-bye, Paris. Bye-bye, New York. Bye-bye, Tokyo. Welcome to the new experience of human existence, in which rooting around for grubs on islands in northern latitudes is the prerequisite for survival.We view ourselves as rational creatures**.** But is it rational to wait like sheep in a pen as oil and natural gas companies, coal companies, chemical industries, plastics manufacturers, the automotive industry, arms manufacturers and the leaders of the industrial world, as they did in Copenhagen, take us to mass extinction? It is too late to prevent profound climate change. But why add fuel to the fire? Why allow our ruling elite, driven by the lust for profits, to accelerate the death spiral? Why continue to obey the laws and dictates of our executioners? The news is grim. The accelerating disintegration of Arctic Sea ice means that summer ice will probably disappear within the next decade. The open water will absorb more solar radiation, significantly increasing the rate of global warming. The Siberian permafrost will disappear, sending up plumes of methane gas from underground. The Greenland ice sheet and the Himalayan-Tibetan glaciers will melt. Jay Zwally, a NASA climate scientist, declared in December 2007: “The Arctic is often cited as the canary in the coal mine for climate warming. Now, as a sign of climate warming, the canary has died. It is time to start getting out of the coal mines.”

### FT key to environmental protection — Exts

#### Free trade can decrease environmental degredation- makes clean tech disbursement more efficient

Harun Onder [Economist in Economic Policy and Debt department @ the World Bank]¶ September 12, 2012¶ What does trade have to do with climate change?¶ <http://www.voxeu.org/article/what-does-trade-have-do-climate-change>

The last few decades have witnessed a rapid expansion of international trade and global output (Figure 1). This growth was partially enabled by a gradual reduction in trade barriers in the major export destinations. According to Baldwin (2006), average tariffs were reduced from 18% in Europe and 15% in North America in the late 1950s to about 4% in North Atlantic countries by the end of the 20th century. In parallel, carbon dioxide (CO2) concentration in the atmosphere increased drastically. However, to what extent is trade responsible for the escalating emissions?¶ Emissions of greenhouse gases do not necessarily rise when countries trade more. Trade theory suggests that a marginal change in trade affects the emission level through three major channels: the scale effect, the composition effect, and the technique effect (see Grossman and Krueger 1992 and Copeland and Taylor 2003 for a detailed analysis).¶ The scale effect refers to an increase in emissions due to a higher level of economic activity, holding other factors constant. Therefore, the sign of the scale effect is generally positive. The composition effect refers to a change in emissions because of a change in the relative shares of different goods in production. If the exported good is relatively greenhouse-gas intensive, then the overall emissions will increase with trade liberalisation. With a comparative advantage in 'clean' industries, however, trade liberalisation will cause a reduction in emissions. Finally, the technique effect refers to the impact on emissions due to a change in production methods. Trade can reduce emissions per unit of output by facilitating the transfer of cleaner technologies or by inducing changes in regulations as demand for environmental quality will increase with income.

## Property Rights Good

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free Trade key to Intellectual property rights-TPP proves

**Korinko, 2013**

(Rachelle, “Trans-Pacific Partnership an opportunity to enforce the intellectual property rights system”, Property Rights Alliance, May 24, <http://www.propertyrightsalliance.org/trans-pacific-partnership-opportunity-enforce-intellectual-a3018>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

This past week the United States and 11 other countries met in Lima, Peru to discuss the free-trade agreement called the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). While the negotiations have been kept relatively secret there are a few topics that have been discussed publically (we are still relying on a leaked document from 2011). The major debates in these negotiations centers on how global markets can better protect copyright and patent laws abroad. One of the proposals seeks not only to protect, but to better enforce through sanctions, nation-states who willfully infringe on copyrights of other nation-states, especially in the media and movie industries. The major goal is to create free-trade agreements among the countries while also developing better mechanisms to protect the intellectual property rights of all states and individuals involved in the negotiations. Free Trade has become something of an anathema in public policy debates and the public discourse. Depending on which side of the debate you are on Free Trade either destroys jobs in your country or promotes greater material wealth. The proponents on either side of the Free Trade debate can be irascible in their arguments with each other. (Note: Free Trade, as discussed here, is not “free-trade” agreements with protectionist provisions – such as infant industry protections or trade adjustment assistance.) Proponents of Free Trade, like Adam Smith and Fredrick Hayek, advance concepts like, competitive advantage and the division of labor from moral and economic perspectives. Those who oppose Free Trade believe that it harms both underdeveloped (Resource Curse and Dutch Disease) and developed (loss of jobs) nations. Consequently, those who oppose Free Trade prefer trade with protectionist programs to quell potential losses.However, the TPP negotiations have aided in altering what Free Trade means for some industries. Free Trade used to be limited to physical goods such as, shoes or cars. However, with the myriad of technological advances in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries the Free Trade arguments have grown to encompass patent and more importantly copyright protection concerns. And understanding how these fit into Free Trade and potential trade agreements is not precisely clear. Property Rights Alliance, as an affiliate of ATR believes in the truth and freedom of Free Trade. Furthermore, Property Rights Alliance believes that the TPP will represent a unique opportunity to enforce the intellectual property rights system domestically and internationally not only in sectors such as: movies, music, or telecommunications but also in agricultural or manufacturing, generally. With the fourth round of TPP negotiations ending today, now is the time to piece together the potential benefits and pitfalls of TPP. Among a variety of industries potentially opening up for free-trade around the world, the most controversial of these topics are copyright laws and pharmaceutical patents. What do copyright laws look like in a completely Free Trade society? Furthermore, how do you protect and foster innovation without undue apprehension over potential lawsuits and trolling? These questions along with other concerns, as well as, potential policy prescriptions will be addressed in greater detail in forthcoming blog posts.

#### Property rights key to economic security

**Omidyar 13** (“Property Rights,” Omidyar Network,

<http://www.omidyar.com/initiatives/property-rights>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

What’s at Stake Property rights are the keys to economic security, identity, and wealth creation. Yet an estimated 72 percent of the world’s population, more than 4 billion people, live on physical property for which they do not hold formal rights or documentation, or live without permanent homes or access to land altogether. Physical property is a fundamental form of capital, and formal rights to that property bring benefits to the people that hold them as well as the societies that can secure them.  For the individual, formal rights enhance social status and political clout, facilitate access to financial services as well as water and electricity, prevent unfair dispossession of land, and provide both the ability and incentive to invest in one’s property to create economic value.  Societies that enforce these rights benefit from greater economic growth, transparency, and political stability, as they encourage investment, promote the rule of law, and give people a stake in the future. Strategy We strive to increase ownership of land and property for all people, encourage transparency and flexibility in property ownership, and develop legal education for property rights. We provide grants to nonprofit organizations focused on establishing legal aid, title registry creation, and policy reform in rural and urban areas to address these issues. We also invest in for-profit companies that provide infrastructure or other programs for land registry. Goal We hope to alleviate poverty and stimulate economies by helping the poor gain access to land, secure rights to that land, and document ownership so that they can sell, transfer, or dispose of their rights as they see fit. With property rights, people can improve their living conditions, invest confidently in their property, enhance their economic security, and improve their social status in the community.

### FT key to property rights – Exts

#### Property rights key to economic growth and competitiveness

**Sharma 13** (Aayush, “The intellectual property rights - something which needs to be cared,” 1/31/2013, Association of Corporate Counsel, <http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=710dad34-08fd-4fd3-bbdd-df5d2017476f>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

WHAT IS THE IMPORTANCE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY? Intellectual property protection is the key factor for economic growth and advancement in the high technology sector. There are good for business, benefit the public at large and act as catalysts for technical progress. For India one among the developing countries have miles to go, as we have a vulnerable collection of traditional, oral, folklore, customary, agricultural, traditional medication like Ayurveda etc. and besides not having much wealth and infrastructure, lack of awareness of IPRs among all strata’s of people, is a major setback to a developing country like India. Today the aggressive and targeted patenting is the need of the hour.

## Poverty/Developing Countries

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Expansion of free trade solves poverty – sparks innovation in developing countries

Larocco 2012 (Lori Ann Larocco is a CNBC producer, columnist, and author,, “In An Increasingly Globalized Economy, Free Trade Is More Important Than Ever”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2012/11/15/in-an-increasingly-globalized-economy-free-trade-is-more-important-than-ever/>)

Austan Goolsbee, former Director of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers and an Economics Professor at the University of Chicago’s Booth School of Business, says this boom in economic participation is because of the expansion of free trade. “It is not only access to the U.S., but it is also arguably the single most important thing for the development of emerging economies,” he said. “The ability to export on trade has been a central pillar for bringing a billion people out of poverty in the last 15 years. China and India have seen a huge boom in development, moving up from poor countries to middle-income. Historically, free trade is fundamental for innovation. Countries that trade are more open outside of their borders. They are open to new ideas, which spark innovation and economic growth.”

**Poverty outweighs all other concerns**

Maguire 1996 ("The Religious Consultation on Population, Reproductive Health & Ethics Population, Poverty and Sustainable Development”, http://www.sacredchoices.org/population\_poverty\_sustainable\_dev.htm,)

Poverty is genocidal and the malignant indifference and masked barbarity that underlie upper class virtue are complicit in the quiet slaughter of the poor. Poverty kills with an efficiency that could only be matched by all-out nuclear war. The wars that we have had are pikers in inflicting death compared to poverty. What war could kill 40,000 infants a day and do so with a silent efficiency that allows the polysaturated guilty to sleep comfortably in their beds, consciences fully anesthetized, with no rumble of distant guns to disturb their rest.

### FT Helps Poverty/Developing Countries – Exts

#### Free Trade decreases wealth imbalance

**Riley and Miller 2010**

(Bryan and Terry, a Jay Van Andel Senior Policy Analyst in Trade Policy at The Heritage Foundation and a Director, Center for International Trade and Economics and the Mark A. Kolokotrones Fellow in Economic Freedom, “Free Trade Fights Wealth Concentration,” The Heritage Foundation, 11-20-10, 7-5-13, http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2010/10/free-trade-fights-wealth-concentration)//KC

When President Obama was still candidate Obama, he traveled to Berlin to share his foreign-policy views with Europeans. "Trade," he told them, "has been a cornerstone of our growth and global development." "But," he added, "we will not be able to sustain this growth if it favors the few and not the many." Good news, Mr. President. It turns out that trade does benefit the many. A new study of global trade policy and economics from the Heritage Foundation shows that free-trading countries enjoy the strongest economies. Even better, the resulting prosperity is more widely shared in those countries than in countries with large barriers to free trade. Put simply, there is more wealth — and less income disparity — in free-trading nations than in protectionist nations. Heritage's Index of Trade Freedom rates countries on a 1-to-100 scale on the extent to which their laws and policies encourage free trade with other nations. In general, 80 is a good score in terms of trade freedom; 72 or less is bad. Heritage then compares those scores to the World Bank's wealth-concentration index. The researchers found that the 10 countries with the highest concentration of income in the hands of the richest 10 percent earned an average trade-freedom score of 70.2. The 10 nations with the least concentration of income averaged a trade freedom score of 84.1 — more than 20 percent higher. The numbers indicate that nations truly interested in "spreading the wealth" should reject protectionism and embrace free-trade policies. Free trade is an effective way to boost overall prosperity as well. The world's 10 poorest countries averaged 64.5 on the Heritage free-trade scale. The 10 with the highest per capita gross domestic product, or GDP, averaged 87. These findings are hugely important, especially now, when free trade is under attack in a way not seen in decades. More Americans than ever work in import-export-related jobs, yet polls indicate the percentage of Americans who say free trade is good for the economy fell from 78 percent in 2002 to 59 percent in 2007. Skepticism as to the benefits of free trade has grown among all income and age groups. This trend may well accelerate as people get increasingly nervous about rising foreign investment in the U.S. from China and other sovereign wealth funds. Voters and policymakers alike expressed outrage when the Chinese energy firm CNOOC tried to purchase the U.S.-based Unocal and reacted similarly when DP World tried to purchase operations at six U.S. ports.

## Warming Bad

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade can decrease warming- makes clean tech disbursement more efficient

Harun Onder [Economist in Economic Policy and Debt department @ the World Bank]¶ September 12, 2012¶ What does trade have to do with climate change?¶ <http://www.voxeu.org/article/what-does-trade-have-do-climate-change>

The last few decades have witnessed a rapid expansion of international trade and global output (Figure 1). This growth was partially enabled by a gradual reduction in trade barriers in the major export destinations. According to Baldwin (2006), average tariffs were reduced from 18% in Europe and 15% in North America in the late 1950s to about 4% in North Atlantic countries by the end of the 20th century. In parallel, carbon dioxide (CO2) concentration in the atmosphere increased drastically. However, to what extent is trade responsible for the escalating emissions?¶ Emissions of greenhouse gases do not necessarily rise when countries trade more. Trade theory suggests that a marginal change in trade affects the emission level through three major channels: the scale effect, the composition effect, and the technique effect (see Grossman and Krueger 1992 and Copeland and Taylor 2003 for a detailed analysis).¶ The scale effect refers to an increase in emissions due to a higher level of economic activity, holding other factors constant. Therefore, the sign of the scale effect is generally positive. The composition effect refers to a change in emissions because of a change in the relative shares of different goods in production. If the exported good is relatively greenhouse-gas intensive, then the overall emissions will increase with trade liberalisation. With a comparative advantage in 'clean' industries, however, trade liberalisation will cause a reduction in emissions. Finally, the technique effect refers to the impact on emissions due to a change in production methods. Trade can reduce emissions per unit of output by facilitating the transfer of cleaner technologies or by inducing changes in regulations as demand for environmental quality will increase with income.

#### Positive feedbacks ensure runaway warming, causes extinction

Speth 2008[James, dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Currently he serves the school as the Carl W. Knobloch, Jr. Dean and Sara Shallenberger Brown Professor in the Practice of Environmental Policy, The Bridge @ the Edge of the World, pg. 26]

The possibility of abrupt climate change is linked to what may be the most problematic possibility of all—"positive" feedback effects where the initial warming has effects that generate more warming. Several of these feedbacks are possible. First, the land's ability to store carbon could weaken. Soils and forests can dry out or burn and release carbon; less plant growth can occur, thus reducing nature's ability to remove carbon from the air. Second, carbon sinks in the oceans could also be reduced due to ocean warming and other factors. Third, the potent greenhouse gas methane could be released from peat bogs, wetlands, and thawing permafrost, and even from the methane hydrates in the oceans, as the planet warms and changes. Finally, the earth's albedo, the reflectivity of the earth's surface, is slated to be reduced as large areas now covered by ice and snow diminish or are covered by meltwater. All these effects would tend to make warming self-reinforcing, possibly leading to a greatly amplified greenhouse effect. The real possibility of these amplifying feedbacks has alarmed some of our top scientists. James Hansen, the courageous NASA climate scientist, is becoming increasingly outspoken as his investigations lead him to more and more disturbing conclusions. He offered the following assessment in 2007: "Our home planet is now dangerously near a 'tipping point.' Human-made greenhouse gases are near a level such that important climate changes may proceed mostly under the climate system's own momentum. Impacts would include extermination of a large fraction of species on the planet, shifting of climatic zones due to an intensified hydrologic cycle with effects on freshwater availability and human health, and repeated worldwide coastal tragedies associated with storms and a continuously rising sea level. .. . "Civilization developed during the Holocene, a period of relatively tranquil climate now almost 12,000 years in duration. The planet has been warm enough to keep ice sheets off North America and Europe, but cool enough for ice sheets on Greenland and Antarctica to be stable. Now, with rapid warming of o.6°C in the past 30 years, global temperature is at its warmest level in the Holocene. "This warming has brought us to the precipice of a great 'tipping point” If we go over the edge, it will be a transition to 'a different planet,' an environment far outside the range that has been experienced by humanity. There will be no return within the lifetime of any generation that can be imagined, and the trip will exterminate a large fraction of species on the planet.

### FT key to solving warming Exts

#### Traditional thinking of free trade is wrong- it fosters action on climate change by providing profit motives

Joshua Meltzer [serves as a fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution] & Katherine Sierra [serves as a senior fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution]¶ December 7, 2011 ¶ Trade and Climate Change¶ <http://hir.harvard.edu/disease/trade-and-climate-change>

There are several links between trade and climate change, but in most cases these connections have been viewed as being in tension or in conflict. For example, there is concern that domestic climate change policies promoting renewable energy may be inconsistent with the rules prescribed by the World Trade Organization (WTO). There are further concerns that United Nations (UN) climate change discussions on the role of intellectual property may undermine WTO intellectual property rules.¶ The potential for conflict between trade and climate change policy is real. However, trade policy can also be used to support climate change action. In particular, an international trade negotiation to reduce trade barriers to goods developed using low-carbon processes could support climate change policy and create incentivize businesses to reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

#### Free trade spreads tech to combat climate change- best research proves

UN Environment¶ Programme & World Trade Organization [Join report issued by research done by the environmental divisions of the UN and WTO]¶ Trade and¶ Climate Change, 2009 [pdf]

International trade can serve as a means for diff using¶ new technologies and know-how (Grossman and¶ Helpman, 1991). International technology diff usion is¶ important because of the highly skewed distribution of¶ spending on research and development (R&D) around¶ the world. Coe, Helpman and Hoff maister (1997)¶ estimate that 96 per cent of global expenditure on¶ R&D is undertaken by only a handful of industrialized¶ countries. Th e distribution of expenditure on R&D¶ is even more skewed than the distribution of world¶ income. Keller (2004) notes that the G-7 countries (the¶ world’s leading industrialized countries) accounted for¶ 84 per cent of global spending on R&D in 1995, but¶ represented only 64 per cent of global gross domestic¶ product (GDP). Since Solow (1956), economists have¶ understood the importance of technological change¶ in raising productivity and underpinning economic¶ growth. Th e greater a country’s exposure to the¶ international economy, the more it gains from R&D¶ activities in other countries (Helpman, 1997).¶ This suggests a similar role for trade in diff using¶ technologies that mitigate climate change. Th e available¶ information indicates that 90 per cent of what is¶ termed the environmental goods and services industry¶ is located in member countries of the OECD.38 Since¶ many OECD countries were among the fi rst to adopt¶ climate change mitigation measures, the already¶ lopsided distribution of technological know-how may¶ become more distorted as the adoption of mitigation¶ measures leads to further innovation in environmental¶ technologies in OECD countries. Porter and van¶ der Linde (1995) have argued that domestic fi rms’¶ compliance with environmental regulations can trigger¶ technological innovations, since such inventions will¶ lower fi rms’ cost of compliance.39 Th e existence of¶ spillovers in climate change technology (i.e. transfers of¶ technological know-how from one country to another)¶ provides one mechanism by which developing countries’¶ own eff orts to combat climate change can benefi t¶ from innovations in OECD countries. Section III.B¶ provides information on trade opening in goods that¶ may mitigate greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Free trade key to adaptation to climate change- allows goods movement from country to country solving scarcity

UN Environment¶ Programme & World Trade Organization [Join report issued by research done by the environmental divisions of the UN and WTO]¶ Trade and¶ Climate Change, 2009 [pdf]

Climate change threatens to disrupt the conditions¶ under which a wide range of goods and services that¶ are important to economic well-being are produced¶ and consumed. Trade may increase the vulnerability to¶ climate change of some countries because it leads them¶ to specialize in the production of products in which¶ they have a comparative advantage, while relying on¶ imports to meet their requirements for other goods¶ and services. These countries may become vulnerable if¶ climate change leads to an interruption in their supply¶ of imported goods and services. However, trade can also¶ provide a means to bridge the diff erences in demand¶ and supply conditions, so that if climate change leads¶ to a scarcity of certain goods and services in a country,¶ it will nonetheless be able to obtain what it needs from¶ countries where these goods and services continue to¶ be available. Thus, beyond mitigation, trade can play¶ a valuable role in helping humankind adapt to the¶ consequences of a warmer future. As discussed in Part I, climate change is likely to¶ significantly affect agricultural production. Without¶ trade, countries facing changed climatic conditions¶ and lower crop yields will confront huge challenges in¶ providing adequate supplies of food and agricultural¶ raw materials to their populations. International trade¶ allows the world to cushion the severity of climate change¶ impacts on global agriculture by making it possible for¶ a country to draw upon its trade partners’ supplies to¶ meet part of the demand for food and agricultural raw¶ materials. But the extent to which international trade¶ can play this buff ering role depends on how economic¶ scarcity or abundance are transmitted in terms of¶ changes in prices across markets (i.e. agricultural prices¶ rising in response to scarcity or falling in situations of¶ abundance). Where prices are distorted by the use of certain trade¶ measures, the contribution that trade can make in¶ helping countries to adapt to climate change may be¶ significantly reduced. If, as mentioned earlier, a country¶ becomes vulnerable to climate change impacts because¶ it has specialized in certain sectors of production (in¶ the case, for example, of a country which specializes in¶ mining, or in the manufacture of automobile parts, but¶ which has a very small agricultural sector), matters will¶ only deteriorate if its partners restrict trade to safeguard¶ their own supplies.¶ A number of economic studies have simulated how¶ trade might help reduce the cost of adapting to climate¶ change in the agricultural or food sectors. Reilly and Hohmann (1993) used the SWOPSIM¶ (Static World Policy Simulation Model) of world food¶ markets to simulate the eff ect of a range of climate¶ change scenarios while allowing countries to partly¶ adjust to these impacts through trade. Th eir scenarios¶ assumed reductions in yield of between 10 and 50 per¶ cent in the US, Canada and the European Communities,¶ and assumed either increases or no change in yield in¶ high-latitude regions (former Soviet Union, Northern¶ Europe, China, Japan, Australia, Argentina, Brazil) and¶ the rest of the world. Th ey fi nd that, even under the¶ assumption of large reductions in food yields, the losses¶ in economic welfare are small relative to GDP (a few¶ hundredths to a few tenths of a per cent) for all the¶ countries identifi ed in the study. Th e study also fi nds¶ that Australia and China would experience large net¶ gains (between 2 and 6 per cent of their GDP). Th eir¶ results illustrate the importance of international trade in promoting interregional adjustments in production¶ and consumption and hence in lowering the costs from¶ climate change.¶ Th e study by Rosenzweig et al. (1993) considers the¶ eff ect that further liberalization in agricultural trade¶ would have on the world’s ability to adapt to climate¶ change. Th e potential variations due to climate change¶ in the yield of some major crops (wheat, rice, maize,¶ and soybeans) were estimated. A number of climate¶ change scenarios were considered in estimating these¶ changes in yields, based on the assumption of a¶ doubling in CO2 levels (to 555 parts per million) by¶ 2060. Th ree general circulation models (GCMs) –¶ sophisticated computer models incorporating detailed¶ observations of various weather phenomena and other¶ factors, which are used to study past, present and¶ future climate patterns – were employed to obtain a¶ range of these climate change scenarios. Th e GCMs¶ employed were from the Goddard Institute for Space¶ Studies, the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory¶ and the United Kingdom Meteorological Offi ce. Th ese¶ projected changes in yields were then fed into a world food trade computer model – the Basic Linked System¶ (BLS) – and projections of the world food market up¶ to 2060 were generated. Th e study fi nds that, with¶ trade opening, global impacts due to climate change¶ would be slightly reduced. Price increases would be¶ slightly less than those that would occur without full¶ trade opening, and the number of people at risk from¶ hunger would be reduced by about 100 million (from¶ the reference case of about 640 million in 2060).¶ Th e study by Hertel and Randhir (2000) continues¶ this focus on trade policies in the agricultural sector¶ and how they may aff ect adaptation to climate change.¶ The study underscores the importance of reducing or¶ eliminating trade-distorting measures, such as subsidies,¶ so as to make international trade a more effective¶ tool for adapting to climate change. Scenarios where¶ international trade helps a country to adapt to climate¶ change all result in net increases in economic welfare¶ at the global level. But international trade contributes¶ more effi ciently as a tool for economic adaptation¶ when agricultural subsidies are eliminated. The global¶ economic welfare gains are nearly six times greater when subsidies are completely eliminated, because large subsidies to agriculture exacerbate inefficiencies¶ in the global agricultural system.40

#### U.S.-China liberalization solve green tech

**Meltzer 2012**

(Joshua, a fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution and an adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies and at Georgetown Law School, “A Trade Policy for President Obama's Second Term,” Washington Post, 11-9-12, Brookings Institution, 7-5-13, http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/11/09-trade-policy-obama-meltzer)//KC

But reducing these U.S. concerns about the RMB and the trade deficit, other areas for cooperation with China like clean energy should open up. President Obama supports developing green energy in the U.S. and China's 12th Five Year Plan includes ambitious domestic renewable energy goals. These goals could be complimentary with the U.S. specializing in high-end green technologies and services and China manufacturing components like solar photovoltaic cells. A liberalized trading regime in green energy would underpin this outcome, leading to the most efficient allocation of resources and reducing the costs of renewable energy in both countries. But concerns in the U.S. about Chinese subsidies for renewable energy and a U.S. focus on developing green manufacturing capacity has already led to WTO litigation. Both countries should instead use the trading system to support this common goal and build on the recent agreement in APEC to reduce tariffs on a range of environmental goods by expanding the list of environmental goods and addressing other trade barriers affecting green energy goods and services.

## A2 Free Trade Bad Scenarios

### A2 Diseases Turn

#### Disease burns out before it can cause extinction – lethal viruses will kill their hosts too fast.

Understanding Evolution 7 (Website on Evolution from UC Berkeley, "Evolution from a virus's view," December, <http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evolibrary/news/071201_adenovirus>)

Since transmission is a matter of life or death for pathogen lineages, some evolutionary biologists have focused on this as the key to understanding why some have evolved into killers and others cause no worse than the sniffles. The idea is that there may be an evolutionary trade-off between virulence and transmission. Consider a virus that exploits its human host more than most and so produces more offspring than most. This virus does a lot of damage to the host — in other words, is highly virulent. From the virus's perspective, this would, at first, seem like a good thing; extra resources mean extra offspring, which generally means high evolutionary fitness. However, if the viral reproduction completely incapacitates the host, the whole strategy could backfire: the illness might prevent the host from going out and coming into contact with new hosts that the virus could jump to. A victim of its own success, the viral lineage could go extinct and become an evolutionary dead end. This level of virulence is clearly not a good thing from the virus's perspective.

Mutations will lead to adaptations, this checks extinction

Susan Hunter (independent consultant to certain agencies of the United) 03 BLACK DEATH: AIDS IN AFRICA, p. 187

In nonhuman animals with HIV-type viruses (cows, horses, sheep, and monkeys), the virus and host have coadapted so that the virus is benign, suggesting that these animals have carried the virus for a longer time than humans and that HIV came into existence before humans and chimps reached their divide on the evolutionary tree. Viruses like HIV, herpes, and chicken pox remain latent in humans after initial symptoms disappear, a special talent that makes biologists believe these viruses are very old.3 Another clue that HIV may have "cohabited" with humans for a very long time is that some humans appear to have partial genetic immunity to the virus. Some prostitutes in Nairobi, Kenya have immune systems that fight off HIV infection as long as they keep having sex. Other Africans also may have some natural immunity to HIV, given the fact that infection levels have stabilized in some countries for no apparent reason but are soaring well beyond the expected ceiling of 30 percent infected in other countries. A genetic trait discovered in 1994 that gives its carriers some immunity to HIV is found in several Caucasian populations in frequencies high enough to suggest nonrandom spread and selection in response to a specific threat. Scientists theorize that the trait may have arisen as an adaptive response to the bubonic plague. Unlike adaptations to typhoid and malaria, however, having two copies of this gene is even better than having one because people with two copies resist HIV infection entirely while people with one copy can get HIV but its progress is slowed. The mutation is most common in Sweden, where 20 percent of the population carries one or two copies, and its frequency tapers down as you travel south in Europe. Only a small percent of Central Asians carry the mutation, which is absent from the rest of the world. The pattern may reflect differences in the spread of pneumonic plague, transmitted through the air, versus bubonic plague, transmitted through rats and fleas. Europe suffered many waves of plague from the Black Death in 1347 through 1650, when the disease finally began to disappear, possibly as a result of rapid buildup of resistance through this genetic mutation.

### A2 Poverty Turn

#### Alt Cause: Oil, Food, and Warming

APA (African Press Agency). "Increase in Food, Oil Prices Driving 100 Million People Into Poverty." 30 June 2008. http://www.netnewspublisher.com/increase-in-food-oil-prices-driving-100-million-people-into-poverty/

The current food and oil price increases tabled for discussion at the African Union summit in Egypt is driving 100 million poor people into deeper poverty, the United Nations said on Monday. The majority of these people living in poverty are said to be Africans who are highly affected by the current food and oil price increases. The oil price is approaching $150 per barrel, which is expected to make the current economic crisis in the developing countries, including Africa worse. “As we speak the food crisis-compounded by the hike in fuel prices and climate change-threatens to push an estimated 100 million people deeper into poverty and will have direct bearing on our efforts to meet the Millennium Development Goals,” said Dr. Asha-Rose Migiro, Deputy Secretary General of the UN.

#### Poverty does not cause war.

The Forum. "Reading the Bible with a Pair of Scissors." 5 June 2005. http://forum.onlineopinion.com.au/thread.asp?article=3417&page=6

The niave assumption that war is caused by poverty cannot explain the Third Reich, or Japanese Imperialism. It is blatently obvious other attitudes motivated their agenda. The fact is the anxiety and displacement of persons by war is one reason for poverty, another is lack of education or resources to deal with the environment. You can give charity to some people all their life and they will never attempt to build a sustainable food source. This also happens here in Australia. Change their minds and give hope of building their own world will take them off Charity. These major problems will only be overcome with a spiritual awakening and the sweat of the brow. Poverty does not cause war, greed causes war, as does unjust oppression of the weak. The real answer is one of the mind and spirit, and not one of enforced law and the allocation of funds. There is a real need of personal enlightenment and politicians are rarely in the forefront of spiritual change.

### A2 Water Wars Turn

#### Water scarcity unlikely to develop into water wars

**Wolf, 4** (Aaron, “Regional Water Cooperation as Confidence Building: Water Management as a Strategy for Peace”, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars)

Summary There are 263 watersheds that cross the political boundaries of two or more countries. These international basins cover 45.3% of the land surface of the earth, affect about 40% of the world’s population, and account for approximately 60% of global river flow (UNEP/OSU 2002). These basins have certain characteristics that make their management especially difficult; most notably, the tendency for regional politics to regularly exacerbate the already difficult task of understanding and managing complex human and natural systems. Disparities between riparian nations – whether in economic development, infrastructural capacity, or political orientation – add further complications to water resource development, institutions, and management. Furthermore, riparian relations occurring at multiple scales often influence each other in disparate ways. As a consequence, development, treaties, and institutions are regularly seen as, at best, inefficient; often ineffective; and, occasionally, new sources of tensions themselves. Despite the tensions inherent in the international setting, riparians have shown tremendous creativity in approaching regional development, often through preventive diplomacy, and the creation of “baskets of benefits”, which allow for positive-sum allocations of joint gains. While many international water negotiations begin with differing legal interpretations of rights, whether measured by hydrography or chronology, they often shift to a needs-based criteria for water allocations, as measured by some mutually agreeable parameter such as irrigable land or population. Mostly, one is struck by the creativity of the negotiators in addressing specific language to each very specific local setting and concerns.

#### Water scarcity alone cannot lead to conflict

**Dinar, 2** (Ph.D. candidate at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, Water, Security, Conflict, and Cooperation, *SAIS Review* vol. XXII no. 2, Summer–Fall 2002)

By itself, water scarcity and its downward pull on economic performance may not be the only cause of conflict. However, when severe scarcities of water are anticipated, and when water is perceived to be overexploited or degraded by others in a harmful and unfair manner, conflict and instability may result.40 Freshwater can therefore be a serious object of contention. Water disputes can either exacerbate already tense relations between riparian countries, or constitute the primary grievance between them. In the first case, conflict between nations is not necessarily caused by a water dispute. For example, in the Arab-Israeli conflict over the Jordan River Basin, the political conflict often impedes progress on the water issue. In addition, in the case of theGanges-Brahmaputra-Meghna (GBM) Basin, the conflict over water exacerbates the lingering political conflict between India and Bangladesh. This phenomenon also makes particular solutions to water issues harder. In the mid-1950s, for example, the United States tried to forge a water agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbors, aiming to make water a catalyst for further cooperation. Given the overall political conflict that existed among the parties, however, the U.S. attempt failed. This diplomatic exercise demonstrated that any assessment of water as a contributing factor to conflict must therefore recognize the social and economic structures within which water use is embedded.41 That said, while water is not the sole cause of instability, an attempt to manage the political conflict without resolving the water conflict will result in failure on the political front.

### A2 Conflict Turn

#### No great power wars – diplomacy and nuclear weapons

David Bosco (Senior Editor at Foreign Policy Magazine) July 23 2006 'Could This Be the Start of World War III?,' http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/sunday/commentary/la-op-bosco23jul23,0,6188365.story?coll=la-sunday-commentary

There is another factor working in favor of great-power caution: nuclear weapons. Europe's leaders on the eve of World War I can perhaps be forgiven for not understanding the carnage they were about to unleash. That generation grew up in a world of short wars that did limited damage. Leaders today should have no such illusions. The installation of emergency hot lines between national capitals was a recognition of the need for fast and clear communication in times of crisis. Diplomatic tools have advanced too. Sluggish though it may be, the U.N. Security Council regularly gathers the great powers' representatives in a room to hash out developing crises.

### A2 Prolif Turn

#### No impact – every actor has incentives to overstate consequences

Farley 11, assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce at the University of Kentucky, (Robert, "Over the Horizon: Iran and the Nuclear Paradox," 11-16, [www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10679/over-the-horizon-iran-and-the-nuclear-paradox))

But states and policymakers habitually overestimate the impact of nuclear weapons. This happens among both proliferators and anti-proliferators. Would-be proliferators seem to expect that possessing a nuclear weapon will confer “a seat at the table” as well as solve a host of minor and major foreign policy problems. Existing nuclear powers fear that new entrants will act unpredictably, destabilize regions and throw existing diplomatic arrangements into flux. These predictions almost invariably turn out wrong; nuclear weapons consistently fail to undo the existing power relationships of the international system. ¶ The North Korean example is instructive. In spite of the dire warnings about the dangers of a North Korean nuclear weapon, the region has weathered Pyongyang’s nuclear proliferation in altogether sound fashion. Though some might argue that nukes have “enabled” North Korea to engage in a variety of bad behaviors, that was already the case prior to its nuclear test. The crucial deterrent to U.S. or South Korean action continues to be North Korea’s conventional capabilities, as well as the incalculable costs of governing North Korea after a war. Moreover, despite the usual dire predictions of nonproliferation professionals, the North Korean nuclear program has yet to inspire Tokyo or Seoul to follow suit. The DPRK’s program represents a tremendous waste of resources and human capital for a poor state, and it may prove a problem if North Korea endures a messy collapse. Thus far, however, the effects of the arsenal have been minimal.¶ Israel represents another case in which the benefits of nuclear weapons remain unclear. Although Israel adopted a policy of ambiguity about its nuclear program, most in the region understood that Israel possessed nuclear weapons by the late-1960s. These weapons did not deter Syria or Egypt from launching a large-scale conventional assault in 1973, however. Nor did they help the Israeli Defense Force compel acquiescence in Lebanon in 1982 or 2006. Nuclear weapons have not resolved the Palestinian question, and when it came to removing the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq, Israel relied not on its nuclear arsenal but on the United States to do so -- through conventional means -- in 2003. Israeli nukes have thus far failed to intimidate the Iranians into freezing their nuclear program. Moreover, Israel has pursued a defense policy designed around the goal of maintaining superiority at every level of military escalation, from asymmetrical anti-terror efforts to high-intensity conventional combat. Thus, it is unclear whether the nuclear program has even saved Israel any money. ¶ The problem with nukes is that there are strong material and normative pressures against their use, not least because states that use nukes risk incurring nuclear retaliation. Part of the appeal of nuclear weapons is their bluntness, but for foreign policy objectives requiring a scalpel rather than a sledgehammer, they are useless. As a result, states with nuclear neighbors quickly find that they can engage in all manner of harassment and escalation without risking nuclear retaliation. The weapons themselves are often more expensive than the foreign policy objectives that they would be used to attain. Moreover, normative pressures do matter. Even “outlaw” nations recognize that the world views the use of nuclear -- not to mention chemical or biological -- weapons differently than other expressions of force. And almost without exception, even outlaw nations require the goodwill of at least some segments of the international community. ¶ Given all this, it is not at all surprising that many countries eschew nuclear programs, even when they could easily attain nuclear status. Setting aside the legal problems, nuclear programs tend to be expensive, and they provide relatively little in terms of foreign policy return on investment. Brazil, for example, does not need nuclear weapons to exercise influence in Latin America or deter its rivals. Turkey, like Germany, Japan and South Korea, decided a long time ago that the nuclear “problem” could be solved most efficiently through alignment with an existing nuclear power. ¶ Why do policymakers, analysts and journalists so consistently overrate the importance of nuclear weapons? The answer is that everyone has a strong incentive to lie about their importance. The Iranians will lie to the world about the extent of their program and to their people about the fruits of going nuclear. The various U.S. client states in the region will lie to Washington about how terrified they are of a nuclear Iran, warning of the need for “strategic re-evaluation,” while also using the Iranian menace as an excuse for brutality against their own populations. Nonproliferation advocates will lie about the terrors of unrestrained proliferation because they do not want anyone to shift focus to the manageability of a post-nuclear Iran. The United States will lie to everyone in order to reassure its clients and maintain the cohesion of the anti-Iran block. ¶ None of these lies are particularly dishonorable; they represent the normal course of diplomacy. But they are lies nevertheless, and serious analysts of foreign policy and international relations need to be wary of them. ¶ Nonproliferation is a good idea, if only because states should not waste tremendous resources on weapons of limited utility. Nuclear weapons also represent a genuine risk of accidents, especially for states that have not yet developed appropriately robust security precautions. Instability and collapse in nuclear states has been harrowing in the past and will undoubtedly be harrowing in the future. All of these threats should be taken seriously by policymakers. Unfortunately, as long as deception remains the rule in the practice of nuclear diplomacy, exaggerated alarmism will substitute for a realistic appraisal of the policy landscape.

### A2 Agriculture Turn

#### New tech and adaption solve food shortages

Michaels 11 Patrick Michaels is senior fellow in environmental studies at the CATO Institute. " Global Warming and Global Food Security," June 30, CATO, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/global-warming-global-food-security

While doing my dissertation I learned a few things about world crops. Serial adoption of new technologies produces a nearly constant increase in yields. Greater fertilizer application, improved response to fertilizer, better tractor technology, better tillage practices, old-fashioned genetic selection, and new-fashioned genetic engineering all conspire to raise yields, year after year.¶ Weather and climate have something to do with yields, too. Seasonal rainfall can vary a lot from year-to-year. That's "weather." If dry years become dry decades (that's "climate") farmers will switch from corn to grain sorghum, or, where possible, wheat. Breeders and scientists will continue to develop more water-efficient plants and agricultural technologies, such as no-till production.¶ Adaptation even applies to the home garden. The tomato variety "heat wave" sets fruit at higher temperatures than traditional cultivars.¶ However, Gillis claims that "[t]he rapid growth in farm output that defined the late 20th century has slowed" because of global warming.¶ His own figures show this is wrong. The increasing trend in world crop yields from 1960 to 1980 is exactly the same as from 1980 to 2010. And per capita grain production is rising, not falling.

### A2 Tobacco Turn

#### Protectionism doesn’t resolve tobacco use – alternative measures are preferred

**Lester 2012** (Simon Lester is a trade policy analyst with Cato’s Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, 8-15-12, “Free Trade and Tobacco: Thank You for Not Smoking (Foreign) Cigarettes, <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/free-trade-tobacco-thank-you-not-smoking-foreign-cigarettes>)

Economics provides us with clear evidence that protectionism is an inefficient policy that makes us worse off. The tobacco industry has some unique characteristics, but the logic of basic economics does not cease to apply in this sector, and thus protection of domestic tobacco producers is no more sensible here than in other sectors. Protection for domestic producers is not a good way to reduce smoking, and there are many effective alternatives. Thus, removing protectionist barriers in the tobacco industry should remain a component of trade and investment agreements. Using these agreements to fight protectionism should not undermine sovereignty or the ability to promote public health. An anti-protectionism rule does not interfere with domestic policymaking to any significant degree. Legitimate health regulation is still possible. At the same time, critics have raised some valid concerns about the scope of trade and investment agreements, in particular with the rules that go beyond simply fighting protectionism. While the principles involved—such as intellectual property and the protection of foreign investments—are important, it may be worth considering whether rules in these areas intrude too much into domestic policymaking. But these issues are not unique to the tobacco industry and, thus, should not lead to special rules for tobacco.

### A2 Small Arms Turn

#### UN Safety measures on small arms are effective

**United Nations 12** (“UN LAUNCHES NEW INTERNATIONAL SMALL ARMS CONTROL STANDARDS,” *United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs*, 8/29/2012, <http://www.un.org/disarmament/update/20120829a/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

29 August 2012 — On August 29, the International Small Arms Control Standards (ISACS) were launched in a side event of the Second Review Conference on the United Nations Programme of Action on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons. The new standards will help to ensure that the UN provides support to Member States on putting in place effective controls over the full life-cycle of small arms and light weapons — from manufacture, marking and recordkeeping to storage, transport and international transfer to the tracing, collection and destruction of illicit weapons. Let's say you're a peacekeeper, or a humanitarian worker, or contributing to reintegration of former combatants, or developing a small arms national action plan with a government. At some point in your work, you would need some guidance on how best to deal with small arms control issues. You may need information on such practical assistance as how to conduct a survey on the small arms situation, how to advise on the best ways to destroy a surplus stock of weapons, or how to design and implement community safety programming. The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons fuels armed violence in conflict, post-conflict and other fragile settings. About 526,000 people die from armed violence every year, at an annual opportunity cost to the global economy of approximately $400 billion. Armed violence destroys lives and livelihoods, breeds insecurity, fear and terror, dissolves social cohesion and hinders achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. The lives of UN staff are also being endangered by the easy availability of weapons.  As Hideki Matsuno, who is responsible for the ISACS in UNODA , notes: "Last year, the Organization recorded 26 armed attacks on UN premises, including five rocket and mortar attacks, 13 attacks using improvised explosive devices, 36 ambushes of UN convoys and 31 cases of hijacking of UN vehicles." The 23 UN entities that make up the UN Coordinating Action on Small Arms (CASA) mechanism have contributed expertise, time and money over the last three-and-a-half years. They also opened the process of developing the standards to experts from governments, international and regional organizations, civil society and the private sector. UN Member States have already negotiated three global agreements aimed at eradicating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. The UN Programme of Action, the International Tracing Instrument and the Firearms Protocol create global norms that could go a long way towards eradicating the black market trade in guns. Following their launch, the standards will be used by CASA partners to support programmes and projects designed to assist Member States in controlling arms and reducing armed violence. The work of drafting the standards may be coming to an end, but the task of applying them is only just beginning.

### A2 Invasive Species Turn

#### Biodiversity isn’t key to survival

Calgary Herald, August 30, 1997

Ecologists have long maintained that diversity is one of nature's greatest strengths, but new research suggests that diversity alone does not guarantee strong ecosystems. In findings that could intensify the debate over endangered species and habitat conservation, three new studies suggest a greater abundance of plant and animal varieties doesn't always translate to better ecological health. At least equally important, the research found, are the types of species and how they function together. "Having a long list of Latin names isn't always better than a shorter list of Latin names," said Stanford University biologist Peter Vitousek, co-author of one of the studies published in the journal Science. Separate experiments in California, Minnesota and Sweden, found that diversity often had little bearing on the performance of ecosystems -- at least as measured by the growth and health of native plants. In fact, the communities with the greatest biological richness were often the poorest when it came to productivity and the cycling of nutrients. One study compared plant life on 50 remote islands in northern Sweden that are prone to frequent wildfires from lightning strikes. Scientist David Wardle of Landcare Research in Lincoln, New Zealand, and colleagues at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, found that islands dominated by a few species of plants recovered more quickly than nearby islands with greater biological diversity. Similar findings were reported by University of Minnesota researchers who studied savannah grasses, and by Stanford's Vitousek and colleague David Hooper, who concluded that functional characteristics of plant species were more important than the number of varieties in determining how ecosystems performed. British plant ecologist J.P. Grime, in a commentary summarizing the research, said there is as yet no "convincing evidence that species diversity and ecosystem function are consistently and causally related." "It could be argued," he added, "that the tide is turning against the notion of high biodiversity as a controller of ecosystem function and insurance against ecological collapse."

#### Species loss is inevitable: they can’t solve all causes

New Straits Times (Malaysia), February 4, 2001

Monash University Malaysia's Bachelor of Science in Environmental Management trains students for careers with the government, industry, non- governmental organisations such as WWF, Greenpeace, Malaysian Nature Society, Friends of the Earth, schools and universities, consulting firms and research organisations. According to Monash lecturer specialising in the ecology of tropical rivers and streams, Dr Catherine Yule, the programme ensures that students understand how the natural environment works and how best to manage it and utilise it in a sustainable fashion. Students study subjects including of environmental science, marine and freshwater biology, chemistry, ecology, soil science, environmental health, forest management, atmospheric processes and microbiology, Yule said. She added that students are introduced to a wide range of laboratory techniques and much of the practical work will be undertaken in the field, leading to careers both in laboratories and in the field. Graduates will be able to conduct scientific studies, develop and enforce regulatory environmental standards and understand the broader social, economic, political and legal aspects of environmental management, Yule said. Having worked as an environmental consultant in Australia, Papua New Guinea, Indonesia and Malaysia for over 20 years, Yule said that environmental management is simply managing the environment to ensure that all species, including human beings, work in harmony with the environment. "There are two ways of looking at environmental management," Yule said. The environment in national forests and recreational parks are "managed from the perspective of plants and animals, where we study what the animals and plants need to survive and multiply". From a human perspective, environmental scientists study ways of protecting the environment in view of new developments in the country, such as setting up of manufacturing plants, housing developments, mining activities, she said. Yule added that managing the environment from a human perspective also includes the safety of the workers themselves. "There is a great need to protect our environment for without it, humans will not survive. A cascade of events from pollution and natural disasters to famine will happen to cause the extinction of the human race," she said. There are also economical reasons for sustainable management of natural resources, Yule said. "Natural resources are a source of income and with these resources depleted, the world economy will not be able to survive. In the end, it is for our own safety and interests to protect the environment. "Esthetically, people enjoy the outdoors and protecting the environment is for self-satisfaction." Yule rates the loss of biodiversity as the number one environmental crisis. "The extinction of species that we know and don't not know of is happening at an alarming rate, caused by pollution and the destruction of habitats. Other crises include global warming, river and air pollution, destruction of rainforests and even over population."

### A2 Human Trafficking Turn

Broader criminal justice system to blame for trafficking – can’t access

Brereton in 97 (David, Director, Research and Co-ordination Division, Criminal Justice Commission, Queensland, “How different are Rape Trials?, British Journal of Criminal Justice, V. 37 No. 2)

Obviously, the unique features of rape cases are important in shaping how defence lawyers exploit 'commonsense' understandings and prejudices about what constitutes consent, and in how they define who is—and is not—a 'deserving' victim. It is also probable diat being a complainant in a rape trial is frequently a more traumatic experience than being a complainant in an assault trial, because of the intimate nature of the matters which are canvassed in rape trials, the length of time which the complainant must spend in the witness box, and the degree of trauma associated with the offence itself. However, this observation, as important as it is for some purposes, should not blind us to the fact that much of what happens in rape trials, rather than being unique to the circumstances of these trials, is a function of broader systemic factors which operate in a wide range of trials. These factors include the constraints imposed by adversarial processes and structures (McBarnet 1983), the structure and logic of legal talk (Matoesian 1993), the laws of evidence and judicial concepts of relevance, the way in which lawyers are trained to cross-examine witnesses and interpret evidence, and courtroom work practices (see, generally, Rock 1993). Because most rape trial researchers have not employed a comparative methodology, they have underestimated—and in some cases even ignored—the role of these other factors. This failure to adopt a broader approach has not only had deleterious consequences for theory development within the literature on rape trials; at the policy level, it has arguably also resulted in too much attention being focused on how to improve rape trial processes in particular, rather than on addressing the shortcomings of the criminal trial process in general.

### A2 Drug Trafficking

#### Drug violence on the decline – not large level

**Dibble 13** (Sandra, worked at The Miami Herald for nearly a decade, specializing in coverage of the Cuban, Nicaraguan and Haitian communities, and was part of a team awarded the Pulitzer Prize in national reporting for uncovering the Reagan administration's clandestine support of the Nicaraguan Contras. She spent three years at The National Geographic, where assignments included writing feature articles about Paraguay and Oaxaca. She has covered the have covered the Tijuana-San Diego border since since 1994, “Has violent crime declined in Mexico?,” *U-T San Diego*, 2/6/2013, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2013/Feb/06/mexico-drug-violence-san-diego/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Violence in Mexico appears to have leveled off or declined in the past year, according to [a new report](http://justiceinmexico.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/130206-dvm-2013-final.pdf) by the Trans-Border Institute at the University of San Diego. “Things are looking a bit better in Mexico,” said David Shirk, the institute’s director and one of the report’s authors. “Particularly in places like Tijuana and Ciudad Juarez, we can say violence has gone down.” The report’s analysis suggests that Mexico could be turning a corner following a period of unprecedented violence as trafficking groups battled each other and government forces. It estimates that the total number of homicides in 2012 fell to “somewhere between 20,000 and 25,000” following a record high in 2011, when one Mexican government tally showed more than 27,000 killings “Available evidence suggests that there has indeed been a significant slowdown in homicides and organized-crime-style killings over the last two years,” the report states. “The main question remains whether violence is in decline or has reached a plateau.” The report’s release on Tuesday comes at a key time for Mexico, about two months after President Enrique Peña Nieto began a six-year term and pledged to bring down the levels of violence in the country. Peña Nieto has promised to focus on crime prevention — a different strategy from his predecessor, Felipe Calderón, who concentrated on dismantling drug-trafficking organizations and arresting their top leaders. Shirk said one of the report’s goals is “to get some clarity on what is the true nature of the security situation in Mexico.” The country’s safety and security are “a vital issue for the United States,” he said. “It’s a country that Americans travel to more than any other country in the world.” At the same time, the study’s authors said, “Mexico’s security situation has arguably attracted a disproportionate amount of attention and concern in international media and policy circles compared to other countries in Latin America.” Honduras has more than four times as many homicides per capita as Mexico, Guatemala twice as many and Colombia one-and-a-half times much, according to the report. The authors said tracking homicide numbers in Mexico is a difficult task, a challenge often raised by academics and human-rights activists in Mexico. The institute’s analysis for 2012 looked at data from the Mexican National Security System, as well as figures reported by two Mexican media organizations, Reforma and Milenio. These sources’ numbers typically do not coincide, and that makes it tough to draw definitive conclusions. As a result, “we don’t know if we could say if it was a significant decrease, but it was at least a leveling off or a modest decrease,” Shirk said. “The concern that I have is just as these critical changes are occurring, the Mexican government has begun to reduce access to data and information that corroborates this. We want to have a measure of whether the Mexican government is succeeding in solving the public-security problem or not.” Mexican scholar Raúl Benítez Manaut, president of the Collective for the Analysis of Security With Democracy, said the Trans-Border Institute’s report “is a good effort, but it doesn’t give me reason for optimism.” While violence in Mexico has decreased, he said, “it is not a significant amount.” The study found that the fewer homicides in northern Mexican states during the past two years — including Baja California, Sonora and Chihuahua — were “offset by increases in homicides elsewhere in the country, notably Colima, Guerrero and Nuevo Leon.” In 2012, the researchers wrote, “the worst violence has remained concentrated in fewer than 10 percent of Mexico’s 2,457 municipalities.” Mexican authorities have credited the drop in crime in areas such as Baja California to the combined efforts of military and law-enforcement agencies. But the report said the dynamics of drug-trafficking groups have played a key role. “While important law-enforcement efforts no doubt explain some of this decline, the ability of the Sinaloa cartel to consolidate its power in the northern states of Baja California, Sinaloa, Sonora and Chihuahua appears to be the major factor,” the authors wrote.

#### Alt Causes to Drug Cartel Violence

**Jones 12** (Nathan, is the Alfred C. Glassell III Postdoctoral Fellow in Drug Policy at the Baker Institute. His areas of interest include U.S.-Mexico security issues, illicit networks and cross-border flows, “Eliminate root causes of violence to “manage” drug cartels,” *Chron*, 10/26/2012, <http://blog.chron.com/bakerblog/2012/10/eliminate-root-causes-of-violence-to-manage-drug-cartels/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Addressing root causes There are two root causes of drug violence in Mexico: (1) the global drug prohibition regime, and (2) weak [state capacity](http://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft5g50071k&chunk.id=d0e3492&toc.depth=100&brand=ucpress). The global drug prohibition regime has allowed high profits for drug trafficking networks that allow them to corrupt and influence the state. On the other hand, the Mexican state has traditionally had little capacity to address the basic social needs of the society and has lacked the security apparatus to address potential threats like cartels.  During eras in which the government colluded with traffickers, this weakness, while present, was not apparent.  As the Mexican government transitioned to [an equilibrium of many trafficking networks and many weak law enforcement agencies](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbrown.edu%2FDepartments%2FPolitical_Science%2Fpeople%2Fdocuments%2FDoes%20illegality%20breed%20violence_CLSC.pdf&ei=saiFULquKMSe2gWUnYC4DQ&usg=AFQjCNG63e58mzRYZRe5Z88ih-_Y-1iE5A&sig2=_Ghysz31rQiYIAH9-qmtqw), it has had scant ability to control traffickers.  The quality and size of those agencies must be dramatically improved in addition to improved social services and the expanded delivery of those services. Kingpin strategies have helped to improve state security capacity by forcing the Mexican government to invest in intelligence capacity. Kingpin strategies will weaken illicit networks, but will also fragment them into smaller diversified criminal groups that necessitate improved state and local governance as they become hyper-violent local problems. The Mexican government is slowly but surely beginning to build improved state capacity. The final piece of the puzzle that will assist the Mexican government in achieving a more rapid and peaceful equilibrium as it weakens cartels and improves its own capacity is to address the fundamental political-economic source of profitable drug networks, the global drug prohibition regime.

### A2 Food Prices Turn

#### New tech and adaption solve food shortages

Michaels 11 Patrick Michaels is senior fellow in environmental studies at the CATO Institute. " Global Warming and Global Food Security," June 30, CATO, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/global-warming-global-food-security

While doing my dissertation I learned a few things about world crops. Serial adoption of new technologies produces a nearly constant increase in yields. Greater fertilizer application, improved response to fertilizer, better tractor technology, better tillage practices, old-fashioned genetic selection, and new-fashioned genetic engineering all conspire to raise yields, year after year.¶ Weather and climate have something to do with yields, too. Seasonal rainfall can vary a lot from year-to-year. That's "weather." If dry years become dry decades (that's "climate") farmers will switch from corn to grain sorghum, or, where possible, wheat. Breeders and scientists will continue to develop more water-efficient plants and agricultural technologies, such as no-till production.¶ Adaptation even applies to the home garden. The tomato variety "heat wave" sets fruit at higher temperatures than traditional cultivars.¶ However, Gillis claims that "[t]he rapid growth in farm output that defined the late 20th century has slowed" because of global warming.¶ His own figures show this is wrong. The increasing trend in world crop yields from 1960 to 1980 is exactly the same as from 1980 to 2010. And per capita grain production is rising, not falling.

### A2 Culture Turn

#### No impact to cultural survival – doesn’t spillover to effect all of humanity

**Coates 2009** – former adjunct professor at George Washington University, President of the Kanawha Institute for the Study of the Future and was President of the International Association for Impact Assessment and was President of the Association for Science, Technology and Innovation, M.S., Hon D., FWAAS, FAAAS, (Joseph F., Futures 41, 694-705, "Risks and threats to civilization, humankind, and the earth”, ScienceDirect, WEA)

The first category of significant dreadful outcomes: the death of cultures, raises definitional questions of what is a culture, and how to define the boundaries on it and what it means for it to disappear. Obviously, most of the cultures that would be at risk today are small, involving thousands, tens of thousands, or surely well under a million people. Cultures larger than that are becoming increasingly globalized, westernized, and part of an expanding international advanced-nation culture, with local flavors in different parts of the world. When we turn to the smaller cultures, there is not even a good guess as to how many there are, but an excellent surrogate for that is the number of languages that there are. Each culture insofar as it is isolated has created its own language. The linguists tell us that languages are dying in great numbers.¶ Another side of the question is, whether the death of cultures is good or bad. There are, worldwide, people who deplore the loss of any culture. (We are not thinking about people, but about the culture of a people.) Unfortunately, they would like to see functional groups of the people at cultural risk preserved to become parts of a living museum. That is unfair and, to say the least, undemocratic. Consider the case of the people who manage and harvest the reindeer in Finland, the Lapps. Their culture is in large part framed around a great annual cycle. The animals are collected together and moved much like the situation so common in our western movies of taking the herds of cattle from Texas to the Midwest slaughter houses and railroad yards. The snowmobile was introduced into Lapp society and has been rapidly changing their customs. Some outsiders, as noted, deplore this. But remember, no one forced the snowmobile on the Lapps; it is their free choice and it is outrageous to think that we would deprive them of free choice to adopt what they see will enhance the quality of their lives. On net, I see the loss of cultures as, in some romantic sense, regrettable and undesirable, but in terms of the overall benefits to humankind, the integration of the minor cultures into a global culture carries far more benefit for them and for the world than local survival does.

### A2 Honeybees Turn

#### Honeybees are not key to survival

**International Herald Tribune** 5-2-**2007**

(http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2007/05/03/healthscience/NA-SCI-US-Honeybees-Weird.php)

The scientist who wrote the paper, Stefan Kimmel, e-mailed The Associated Press to say that there is "no link between our tiny little study and the CCD-phenomenon ... anything else said or written is a lie." And U.S. Department of Agriculture top bee researcher Jeff Pettis laughs at the idea, because whenever he goes out to investigate dead bees, he cannot get a signal on his cell phone because the hives are in such remote areas. Also on the Internet is a quote attributed to Albert Einstein on how humans would die off in four years if not for honeybees. It is wrong on two counts. First, Einstein probably never said it, according to Alice Calaprice, author of "The Quotable Einstein" and five other books on the physicist. "I've never come across it in anything Einstein has written," Calaprice said. "It could be that someone had made it up and put Einstein's name on it." Second, it is incorrect scientifically, Pettis said. There would be food left for humans because some food is wind-pollinated.

#### No impact to honeybee dieoff

**Smith 2007**

(Heather, Slate, July 13, http://www.slate.com/id/2170305/pagenum/2)

But is CCD such a tragedy? The honeybee may be the only insect ever extended charismatic megafauna status, but it's already gone from the wild (and it wasn't even native to North America to begin with). Sure, it makes honey, but we already get most of that from overseas. What about the $14.6 billion in "free labor"? It's more expensive than ever: In the last three years, the cost to rent a hive during the California almond bloom has tripled, from $50 to $150. Good thing the honeybee isn't the only insect that can pollinate our crops. In the last decade, research labs have gotten serious about cultivating other insects for mass pollination. They aren't at the point yet where they can provide all of the country's pollination needs, but they're getting there. This year the California Almond Board two-timed the honeybee with Osmia lignaria—the blue-orchard bee: Despite CCD, they had a record harvest.\*

# Free Trade Bad - Links

any place you see free trade remember trade liberalization = synonym

### Bilateral trade agreements = free trade

#### U.S. BTAs cause liberalization- Vietnam proves

**Fukase 2013**

(Emiko, The Graduate Center, the City University of New York, USA,“Export Liberalization, Job Creation, and the Skill Premium: Evidence from the US–Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement (BTA),” SciVerse, January 2013, EBSCOhost, 7-7-13, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X1200157X)//KC

The impact of the BTA on Vietnam’s labor market provides an excellent opportunity to remedy this gap in the trade liberalization and wage inequality literature. First, the BTA presents an opportunity to examine, on the export side, how a tariff cut by a country’s trading partner influenced job opportunities and wages of workers with different skill levels. Second, the US tariff cut on Vietnam’s exports was exogenous,3 sudden, and large. Before the BTA, Vietnam’s access to the US market was quite limited since Vietnam faced the US general tariff rate (at around 35% in simple average) which was much higher than the US Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) tariff rate of around 4.9% (Fukase & Martin, 2000). Immediately after the BTA came into effect on December 10, 2001, the United States granted MFN status to Vietnam lowering the tariff rates across the board. As a result, Vietnam’s exports to the United States, in particular, those of labor-intensive manufacturing goods, expanded dramatically. Starting from a very low level, the United States absorbed 38.3% of Vietnam’s textiles exports, 56.9% of apparel, 16.6% of footwear/leather, and 26.2% of furniture and miscellaneous manufacturing exports by the year 2004 (the UN Comtrade System). Finally, unlike most of the cases in the literature, labor reallocation toward more labor-intensive manufacturing appears to have occurred in the aftermath of the BTA.

#### Bilateral trade agreements result in free trade- TTIP proves

**Jun, 2013**

(Shang, “Commentary: U.S. –EU trade deal adds to fear for failure of global approach”, English News China, July 8, <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/indepth/2013-07/08/c_132521742.htm>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

The United States and the European Union (EU) start Monday the first round of negotiations over a bilateral free trade deal that could be the world's biggest in history.Given that the United States and the EU together account for nearly half of global economic output and a third of global trade flows, there is no doubt that the Transatlantic Trade & Investment Partnership (TTIP) will have a major impact not only on the two hefty economies themselves, but also on the landscape of global trade.Proposed decades ago, the U.S.-EU free trade negotiations finally get started thanks to the pressing need for an economic boost on both sides of the Atlantic in the aftermath of the latest international financial crisis and the ensuing sovereign debt crisis.It is estimated that the TTIP will generate an annual benefit worth over 100 billion U.S. dollars for each side by removing trade barriers, opening up the service sector and promoting investment.The two sides expect the deal to add 0.5 percentage point to the EU's economic growth rate and 0.4 percentage point to that of the United States by 2027, which are considerable compared with the current sluggish growth in the two economies.Though most U.S. and European analysts set a positive tone for the bilateral effect of the TTIP, its broader impact on the global trade system is mixed.By launching negotiations on a bilateral free trade deal, Washington and Brussels are showing their commitment to trade liberalization.However, they also send a clear signal that the two trading powers would like to go their own way and prefer a bilateral approach as the Doha Round of global trade talks remain deadlocked after negotiations for more than a decade.The benefits of the bilateral approach are obvious. It would be much easier for the United States and the EU to find a compromise than for the 159 members of the World Trade Organization (WTO).But what is more important is that the United States and the EU, with their economic and trade clout, can join hands to dictate the future rules of global trade and force others to follow. That is why the two sides have put harmonization of standards and regulations high on the agenda.

### Bilateral trade agreements help/increase credibility the WTO

#### WTO engaging bilateral trade treaties to counter protectionism – effective strategy

**Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer 13** (“The rise of protectionism And the implications for doing business,” *Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer*, <http://www.freshfields.com/en/insights/The_rise_of_protectionism/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The rise of protectionism. And the implications for doing business The World Trade Organisation has identified a rise in protectionism prompted by the global economic slowdown. The WTO sees this as a 'worrying trend' that could stall growth and make recovery more difficult. In this seminar, we look at trade restrictions and other hurdles you might face when doing business. International partners from our competition and global arbitration groups will join us to discuss how best to manage these issues – including through the use of bilateral investment treaties – as well as looking at how best to recover any losses.

### Regional trade agreements increase credibility of the WTO

#### WTO plays complimentary role in RTAs- doesn’t hurt credibility

Wilton Park 2012 (“Gauging international attitudes towards rules-based systems of economic governance”, 11-13-12, <https://www.wiltonpark.org.uk/gauging-international-attitudes-towards-rules-based-systems-of-economic-governance/>)

A number of factors frustrate effective economic governance. The Minister spoke about the corrosive impact of corruption in undermining rules and distorting markets. He also recognised that the process for developing and negotiating the standards must be open and transparent. All countries must have a fair chance to influence change as this lends credibility to the rules and encourages compliance. After the Minister’s speech (PDF document) the conference participants discussed some of the issues he had raised in greater depth including which rules need fixing most urgently, and how to secure universal acceptance of existing or new rules. Participants were eager to discuss the current institutional architecture – whether it should be radically changed or whether it can be improved. The World Trade Organisation (WTO) should play a complementary role in relation to regional trade agreements. The WTO should also be more sympathetic to emerging and re -emerging countries to ensure that they can comply with the rules and fully enjoy the benefits of a rules based system.

### Export credits = free trade/reduce barriers

#### Export credits incentives open trade

**Klasen 13** (Andreas, Managing Director of the official German export credit insurance, Export Credit Availability and Global Trade Andreas Klasen Global Policy Volume 4, Issue 1, pages 108–109, February 2013 Article first published online: 27 MAR 2013, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1758-5899.12025/full>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Global trade plays an important role in strengthening the economy, and generating growth through trade has been a central pillar in the policy strategy of many countries. As several authors have observed, international trade played a substantial role in strengthening economic recovery during the 2008–09 recession and the euro debt crisis as a non-debt-creating source of growth. Government instruments such as export credit agencies (ECAs) have successfully supported trade flows during these crises. ECAs play a crucial role in the promotion of exports in both highly industrialised and developing economies. They facilitate exports and secure jobs in the national economy. Furthermore, they give importers in emerging markets access to finance in situations and on terms not available in private markets. Governments and international financial institutions thus step in to fill the financing gap left by private markets. Exporters frequently require export credits and insurance cover for risks linked to export transactions. Typically, these risks arise from nonpayment for political or commercial reasons. Political causes of loss can be the lack of hard currency in the buyer's country or, for example, wars, civil unrest or a payment moratorium imposed by a government. Commercial risks include payment defaults by the customer or insolvency leading to temporarily uncollectible receivables or full write-offs. The article by Coleman lays out the need for export credit and export credit insurance. Because the export credit coverage available from private insurance companies is sometimes restricted, export transactions can often be realised only on the basis of governmental support. This includes, for example, manufacturing risk insurance, short-term cover for nonmarketable risks and credit insurance for medium- and long-term export business. Coleman's article regarding the necessity of export credit and export credit insurance is followed by a discussion of the role of ECAs in a BRIC economy by Muralidhar. As official or quasi-official branches of their governments and an integral part of national governments' industry and trade-promotion strategies, ECAs are highly relevant for fast-growing economies such as Brazil, Russia, India and China. These countries pursue their aims by providing an increasing amount of export credit insurance facilities for export transactions through direct lending or pure cover support. Collectively, ECAs account for the world's largest source of government financing for private-sector industries: together with investment and private credit insurers, they covered more than £1.2 trillion of global trade in goods and services in 2011, comprising more than 10 per cent of international trade – a record amount. Muralidhar shows how the Indian ECA (ECGC) plays an important role in, for example, supporting banks that extend export finance.

### Joint ventures = free trade/reduce barriers

#### Joint ventures expand market access and incorporate trade

PR Newswire 2012 (4-18-12, <http://www.thermoenergy.com/media-center/press-releases?detail=1023>, “ThermoEnergy and Logica Eko to Form Joint Venture in Colombia”)

"This joint venture is a perfect marriage of our technology and the skills and successful track record of Logica Eko to make Colombia's industries more environmentally sustainable," explained ThermoEnergy Chairman and CEO Cary Bullock. "We also expect the venture to bring new revenues to both companies—and open up new opportunities in other South American markets." Under the term sheet signed by ThermoEnergy and Logica Eko, the companies are forming a joint venture to use ThermoEnergy equipment and engineered systems to produce biogas from landfills and fertilizer and biogas from ammonia and other byproducts of the palm oil processing process. The biogas can then be used to produce electricity to sell to the grid. In addition, the technology will reduce emissions of methane from the landfills and palm oil plants to the atmosphere, making it possible to sell carbon credits. The joint venture also takes advantage of the recently passed free trade agreement between Colombia and the United States. The agreement allows ThermoEnergy's equipment to be shipped duty free to Colombia. From there, Logica Eko expects to be able to sell ThermoEnergy's equipment effectively in other markets, such as Brazil.

### Aid = free trade/reduce barriers

#### Development Aid promotes liberalization

**Hoekstra and Koopmann 2012**

(Ruth and Georg, Ruhr Universität Bochum - Faculty of Economics and Hamburg Institute of International Economics, “Aid for Trade and the Liberalization of Trade,” ProQuest, April 2012, EBSCOhost, 7-6-13, http://search.proquest.com/docview/1034566260?accountid=7113)//KC

The AfT initiative seeks to build a bridge between development and trade policy. In essence, AfT is foreign assistance to DCs in the negotiation, design, implementation, and assessment of trade policy and of policies that are complementary to and compatible with trade liberalization. Such policies comprise measures, regulations, and institution building with a variety of purposes: modernization of infrastructure and customs administration, in order to reduce transaction costs and facilitate trade; overhaul of the legal framework to secure property rights, enforcement of contracts, and functioning bureaucracies; industrial policies, technological support, and training programmes to build competitive production structures, improve professional qualification, and thus promote structural adjustment to trade liberalization; labour market reforms to increase inter- and intra-sector labour mobility; set-up of social safety nets to compensate those who lose their jobs due to import growth; tax reforms to make up for the loss of tariff revenues from trade liberalization; financial market reforms to provide small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) with funds for investment; and appropriate macroeconomic and exchange rate policies to strengthen international competitiveness. The ultimate objective of AfT therefore is to mobilize resources for the creation of trade capacity conducive to economic development and poverty reduction in DCs.

### Loans = free trade/reduce barriers

#### Loans help economies to open up which facilitates trade

Business Insights 2012 (3-19-12, “Trends Driving Opportunities in Latin America”, <http://aircargoinsights.com/fslider/business-with-latin-america-top-trends/>)

Trend Two: Economic Institutions Strengthening Trade and investment regimes have been liberalized, foreign direct investment has increased and new export markets have come on stream. The region now attracts around 7% of global foreign direct investment and accounts for 6% of global exports. These positive signs are evidence the region’s economic institutions are growing stronger. Collaborative efforts, such as the Latin American Reserve Fund (FLAR), consisting of Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, offers loans or loan guarantees, improves investment conditions in international reserves, and helps harmonize exchange rate, monetary, and financial policies of member countries. There has also been a growth in banking throughout Latin America, driven by a growing middle class, growth in deposits and credit, and greater banking efficiency.

### Solve Jobs = Free Trade

#### Job loss Leads to a wave of protectionism

**Friedberg ‘8** [Mr. Friedberg is a professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School. Mr. Schoenfeld, senior editor of Commentary, is a visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute in Princeton, N.J., “The Dangers of a Diminished America”, WSJ, 10-21, http://online.wsj.vom/articles/SB122455074012352571.html]

Protectionist sentiments are sure to grow stronger as jobs disappear in the coming slowdown. Even before our current woes, calls to save jobs by restricting imports had begun to gather support among many Democrats and some Republicans. In a prolonged recession, gale-force winds of protectionism will blow.

### Economic engagement = free trade/reduce barriers

#### U.S. economic engagement causes trade liberalization

**Donilon 2013**

(Tom, National Security Advisor in the Obama Administration, “The President's Free-Trade Path to Prosperity,” Wallstreet Journal, 4-15-13, 7-5-13, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323741004578420843565131294.html)//KC

International economic engagement has been a defining pillar of United States leadership and prosperity for decades. It helped turn former enemies into close allies and major trading partners. It forged an international economic architecture on the bedrock principles of fair competition, open markets, and rules-based trade and investment. It lowered economic barriers and made possible the rise of vibrant middle classes abroad and in America

#### U.S. economic policies inherently ingrained in free trade

**Donilon 2013**

(Tom, National Security Advisor in the Obama Administration, “The President's Free-Trade Path to Prosperity,” Wallstreet Journal, 4-15-13, 7-5-13, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323741004578420843565131294.html)//KC

Our intent is for these initiatives to contribute to rules-based trade world-wide. The Obama administration remains committed to the multilateral trading system and is leading the way in seeking achievable market-opening approaches on trade facilitation, services and information technology. The U.S. hopes to realize the gains of freer and fairer trade and investment with every region, from the new democracies of the Middle East to the fast-growing economies in Africa and our own hemisphere. President Obama's National Security Strategy lays out two overarching challenges: Restore our strength at home and restore our standing in the world. The President's international economic policy will help us do both.

#### Entrepreneurial activity causes liberalization

**Haller 2011**

(Alina-Petronel, International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories/ Romanian Academy – Branch of Iaşi, “MOTIVATING FACTORS OF LIBERALIZATION AND PROTECTIONISM DECISIONS IN THE KNOWLEDGE-BASED SOCIETY, 6-1-11, EBSCOhost, 7-6-13)//KC

From this perspective, innovation and entrepreneurial activity look like a cause of economic growth and liberalization, and the stock of natural resources, that of physical and human capital, occupies a secondary position. The importance of the entrepreneurial activity is justified by the very fact that real economy is characterized by incertitude, and the amount, quality and intensity of the entrepreneurial activity are consequences of some given favourable economic and social conditions. Liberalization, economic growth and development are sustained by the fact that the entrepreneurs, the managers and people in general manifest their preference for cooperation and progress. Since the World War II until now, several factors have been regarded as a cause of economic development and growth and as motivators of economic liberalization and protectionism, according to the case. The investments in industry, the investments in infrastructure, industrialization by substituting imports, rise of the society’s education level, the import of high technology and the wide implementation of the technological progress, the preferential treatment of the less developed countries in the international trade, the annulation of foreign debts and the increase of the international economic aid, political stability and democracy, information and knowledge, etc. have been regarded, one by one, as major factors of economic development and growth and as reasons to eliminate the obstacles in the way of the movement of products and people between countries and to find new modalities to protect economy and society.

### Mexico Economic Engagement -> Global trade

#### Engagement with Mexico results in bargaining power which advances free trade

Pastor and Barbee, ’13 – prof @ American University and U.S. trade policy researcher (Robert and Inu, “Neighbors should not be an after-thought when it comes to trade strategy”, 5/1, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congresstp-blog/economy-a-budget/297253-neighbors-should-not-be-an-after-thought-when-it-comes-to-trade-strategy>, CMR)

This week, President Barack Obama will be in Mexico to meet with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto. Though security has been at the center of the U.S.-Mexico agenda in recent years, the relationship encapsulates much more than that. This trip provides a vital opportunity to refocus the agenda on our economic ties and build upon the success of NAFTA, but President Obama has instead been concentrating his attention on completing negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and beginning a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) with Europe. These are commendable initiatives, but the administration has not informed us of the advantages of these agreements as compared to others. Nor has it offered a realistic strategy to achieve either of them. ¶ Fortunately, this week’s trip to Mexico should reaffirm the president to look no further than our neighbors to find the best path to global competitiveness and the best leverage to negotiate the two deals. In 2011, 48 percent of North America’s merchandise exports went to the three NAFTA partners, for a total of $1.1 trillion. This is twice the total of merchandise exports to Asia ($476 billion) and almost triple what we export to Europe ($383 billion). Furthermore, 25-40 percent of the value of U.S. imports from its neighbors comes from components made in the United States. Canada and Mexico are not only the United States’ most important markets and the largest source of energy imports, but also vital links in North American supply chains. ¶ The proliferation of free trade agreements has not had much effect on the composition or direction of trade. Trade still occurs in higher volumes within regions than between regions. Therefore, to boost competitiveness, we need to deepen integration and create a seamless continental market. A customs union is the next step. ¶ Two separate tasks are needed: the removal of all internal customs duties and quantitative restrictions among the three countries, and second, the harmonization of tariffs to third countries to create a common external tariff (CET) towards non-member states. The original six members of the European Economic Community tried to achieve both in a span of 12 years (1958-1970), and while they did not quite make it, trade among the six grew almost six-fold by the time the customs union was virtually completed in 1970. The competitiveness gained by integrating European production chains created a platform for tripling the region's trade with the rest of the world. By 1970, the Community accounted for 1/3rd of total world trade, a 10 percent increase from 1958. Economies that were devastated at the end of the war, emerged together as a globally competitive powerhouse, second only to the United States and growing almost twice as fast. ¶ Much of this growth is due to the elimination of costly barriers to trade, especially the elimination of rules of origin requirements. This is the moment for North America to take the same jump. Economists have estimated that rules of origin, which stop all products at the border to determine the North American content, cost anywhere from $36 billion to over $400 billion a year, depending on whether indirect effects are included. That is a whopping, unnecessary tax. ¶ Harmonizing tariffs should begin with tariff lines that have differences of less than 10 percent. About 40 percent of U.S. and Canadian MFN tariffs are within 1-2% of each other, and will be easy to adjust. For most cases this will mean lowering tariffs to U.S. levels. Ironically, Mexico is most supportive of this approach, though they would be most costly to them. That's because they are eager to ascend to the first world economically and because their leadership is the most far-sighted. ¶ The common tariffs collected at the border should be placed in a North American Investment Fund to build continental highways, improve railroads, and develop intermodal transportation. Nothing would narrow the income gap with Mexico or expand its buying power as effectively as that, and nothing would stimulate growth in all three countries more. A common tariff would mean eliminating customs forms and hassles at our two borders so that our officials can focus on drugs, terrorists, and undocumented workers. A common approach would allow us to focus on regulatory harmonization while strengthening our bargaining power in multilateral talks. ¶

### Mexico border efficiency = Free trade

#### Increase in export efficiency from Mexico increases free trade

Wilson 2012 (Christopher Wilson is an Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 3-29-12, “Mexico Institute in the News: The Politics of Exports and Jobs”, <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/mexico-institute-the-news-the-politics-exports-and-jobs>)

Republican presidential hopeful Rick Santorum won the Louisiana primary on Saturday, pumping new life into his campaign following last week’s big win by Mitt Romney in Illinois, where I live. The battle for the GOP nomination probably will stretch into summer. “The race is long and far from over,” said Santorum. That means the former senator from Pennsylvania will keep on talking about how to create jobs in an economy with an unemployment rate that floats above 8 percent. One of the best ways is with exports–and Santorum should tell a positive story about how his own view on free trade has evolved from occasional skepticism to a full embrace of how much our economy benefits when goods and services flow across borders. Santorum can start with what he’s proposing right now. On his 32-point economic plan, boosting exports is item no. 19: “Negotiate 5 Free Trade Agreements and submit to Congress in first year of Presidency.” That’s an ambitious agenda. President Obama has been in office for more than three years but he has managed only three deals. He deserves enormous credit for completing the pacts with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea–each one will help our economy. So five free-trade agreements in 12 months is a tall order. Yet it’s also a worthy goal. He is looking in the right direction. Santorum does have some experience with helping trade agreements move through Congress. As a senator, he voted to approve deals with Australia, Chile, Morocco, Oman, and Singapore, plus the Central American Free Trade Agreement. He also favored Trade Promotion Authority, which presidents must have to engage in serious trade talks with other countries. Yet Santorum was no free-trade purist. In fact, there’s a big blemish on his voting record. Almost 20 years ago, he had a chance to join a bipartisan majority and deliver a job-creating jolt to the U.S. economy–but he turned it down. In 1993, Santorum came out against the North American Free Trade Agreement, in what the Club for Growth has described as “perhaps the most important free trade vote of the last generation.” Santorum, who hails from the Pittsburg area, said he was worried about the fate of the steel industry. “NAFTA will produce pockets of winners and losers across the country,” he said. “Our area is unfortunately one of the losers.” It wasn’t that simple–certainly not for Pennsylvania. The Keystone State currently exports more than $2 billion per year to Mexico, according to Christopher Wilson in “Working Together,” a report for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Almost a quarter of a million Pennsylvanians owe their jobs to the Mexican market. Metal manufacturing alone accounted for $467 million of Pennsylvania’s exports to Mexico last year. When Santorum voted against NAFTA, he explained his opposition this way: “You have to stare in the face of the folks you represent.” He went on to support steel tariffs, again because he thought his constituents needed the government to shield them from international competition. The President of the United States must represent the whole of the United States, not just one part of it–and NAFTA has benefited everyone. Today, Mexico is the second-largest destination for U.S. exports. About one in 24 American workers receives a steady paycheck because of the goods and services that flow to Mexico. Trade with Canada, our other NAFTA partner, also creates millions of jobs in the United States. Santorum should acknowledge that he has learned from his mistake. The Pennsylvania primary is on April 24–that would provide an excellent opportunity for Santorum to say that as president, he will set aside the parochialism of his past and support trade policies that will help Americans everywhere. Saying so in front of his old constituents would signal to the rest of the country that he’s serious about creating jobs through trade. Exports generate jobs–and one of the most important jobs of the president is to generate exports.

### Cuba Energy Development = Free Trade

#### Cuba seeking to develop energy sources to avoid dependence – time frame for renewable energy means Cuba will explore free trade zones

CWC 2013 (CWC School – Energy News, Date Last Updated – 2013, “Cuba: Seeking New Partners”, <http://www.cwcschool.com/cuba-seeking-new-partners/>)

CUBA: Seeking new partners Political uncertainty in Venezuela has focused Cuban government minds on the need to find new trading partners and reduce vulnerability to energy shocks. Cuba’s vulnerability to events in Venezuela stems from its energy import dependence. Imports account for around two-thirds of its oil needs, and all of its imports of oil come from Venezuela. Although an interruption to deliveries now would not be as devastating as it was when the Soviet Union disappeared in 1990-91 (when Cuba imported 90% of its oil and lost its only supplier), a sudden loss of Venezuelan shipments would be immediately felt in the domestic economy. This new dependency was initiated in December 2004, when the then presidents of the two countries, Fidel Castro and Hugo Chávez, celebrated the launch of the Venezuela-led left-wing regional bloc, the Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América (ALBA). The agreement allowed Cuba to pay for its oil imports by exchanging them for Cuban professional (mainly medical) services, and favourable financing terms were available. As a result, Cuba was protected from the impact of oil price fluctuations (with international prices doubling between 2004 and 2008, and remaining high and volatile since then). Cuban policymakers are now acutely aware that if there were any sudden disruption to supplies from Venezuela, they would be immediately faced with a double problem: securing new oil suppliers in a hurry to replace Venezuelan shipments; and finding new sources of finance to pay for the oil. This context may explain the significance of official talks with representatives of the governments of a series of oil-producing countries, including Brazil, Angola, Russia, Iran and Saudi Arabia, since the start of this year. It seems likely that the Cubans have been investigating the possibility of arranging shipments from these alternative suppliers, if necessary, at short notice. But even if the logistical challenge could be met, paying for the oil would remain difficult. The latest full official data for the composition and source of imports suggest that Cuba would need to spend around US$4bn, or around one third of its total import capacity, to replace supplies from Venezuela. In the short term, oil could only be obtained from the new sources if the suppliers would be willing to offer some sort of financing, because Cuba has such restricted access to international financial markets (due to both its own poor payments record and US sanctions, which deter not only US but also most international banks from lending to Cuba). By cementing friendly official relations with these countries, Cuba may be hoping to secure emergency credit lines in the case of an emergency. In the longer term, Cuba needs to either find new sources of export earnings or reduce dependence on imported oil. The most obvious way to replace the earnings from the sale of professional services to Venezuela is to find alternative markets for those services. The announcement in early May that Brazil had agreed to take 6,000 Cuban doctors marks an important milestone towards the diversification of markets, although the number is less than 20% of those currently working in Venezuela, and the price is unlikely to be as favourable. There remains the potential for selling more medical services to other countries, but these markets will take time to develop. Cuba already has medical professionals working in more than 100 countries, but most are provided for free or at low prices, as part of Cuba’s ‘internationalism’. Official statements suggest that some progress has been made in recent years to negotiate improved terms, but the available Cuban balance of payments accounts suggest that, so far, most of the earnings from Cuban professionals still come from Venezuela. Beyond professional services, Cuba’s export earnings remain concentrated in a few products and a few markets, none of which could fill the gap left by the loss of trade links with Venezuela in the medium term. Tourism accounts for around 15% of earnings, but after a take-off in the 1990s (rising from less than US$300m to US$2bn), the market has matured and growth rates have dwindled to an average of just 3%. The tourist market is more widely diversified than any of Cuba’s other export products. Canada accounted for 38% of the total in 2012, but otherwise the source countries are well dispersed, with one third coming from all over Europe and one quarter from Central and South America. Goods exports account for only 37% of all export earnings, and of that almost half is accounted for by gross earnings from the processing of Venezuelan oil at a Cuban-Venezuelan joint venture refinery. Net earnings from these exports are only a fraction of that amount. The next most important export product is nickel (8% of earnings), most of which is exported to China and the Netherlands. Medicines, sugar and cigars each account for less than 5% of total export earnings. Some growth might be achieved from these (currently the most promising appears to be sugar, which is beginning a recovery after more than two decades of decline). The realisation of the need for new export industries is driving some of President Raúl Castro’s economic reforms. The rules for foreign direct investment are being reviewed in an attempt to attract new capital and technologies. Its results are expected to be announced in July. Already there have been adjustments to the regulations governing foreign investment in real estate, to allow several long-delayed projects for golf course developments to go ahead. A new free trade zone being developed at the port of Mariel is intended to attract investors in manufacturing and assembly, and help Cuba gain access to markets further afield. Brazil has been Cuba’s main partner in the development of the port, and with the new facilities ready to handle the larger vessels that will travel through the widened Panama Canal from 2015, access to Asian markets will improve. However, for as long as Cuba’s closest and largest market, the US, remains closed by economic sanctions, inserting Cuban manufacturing into international production chains, and finding new destinations for manufactured exports, will remain a challenge. The difficulties faced by Cuba in developing new export products serve to underline the urgent need for it to increase energy security. Hopes for an oil discovery in Cuba’s deep sea territory in the Mexican Gulf have waned in the past year, as three exploratory wells have come up negative. A fourth is due to report its results at the end of June. If that one also disappoints, oil production is likely to continue to diminish in the medium term (in 2011 production was 63,000 barrels a day (b/d), down from 74,000 b/d in 2003) as existing coastal wells reach exhaustion. This prospect is focusing minds on the possibilities for the development of renewable fuels. Of the options available, the most likely to have a major impact is sugar cane bagasse, which could replace oil as the main source of electric power within a few years. A UK-Cuban joint venture, which uses new technology to burn bagasse to feed into the electricity grid, is under construction, and a further series of similar schemes is being planned. Wind, biogas, solar power and other potential renewable energy technologies are also being explored. The pace of development of substitutes for oil is constrained by the lack of financing, and in the meantime, if supplies are interrupted, Cuba faces the spectre of a recurrence of some of the difficulties of the early 1990s. The impact on production might be mitigated through scheduled black-outs and rationing of supplies, but the effect on morale would be severe. For many Cubans, real incomes have yet to return to their pre-1990 level, and hopes of improvement have grown as the economic reform process has developed, despite all official efforts to temper expectations. The search for alternative suppliers of oil in case of an emergency is therefore a political imperative, as well as an economic one. For the longer term, the sustainability of Cuba’s development model also depends on escaping from over-dependence on both a single trading partner, and imports of energy.

### Cuba Oil Open = Free Trade

#### Economic engagement in Cuba will be spun as free trade

Luxner 2012 (Larry Luxner is news editor of The Washington Diplomat. 10-1-12, “State Official Makes Her Mark on Rising Western Hemisphere”, <http://washdiplomat.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=8560&Itemid=414>)

In the meantime, Jacobson said the detention of Gross "has clearly stimulated a review" of USAID's pro-democracy programs in Cuba. "For years, the United States has had programs in places that were difficult and dangerous. We have a commitment to continue helping democracy activists, working with incipient civil society, but we'll do that in a way that reduces as much as possible the dangers to people working there," she said. "Some of the guidelines are different than they were before. We want to make sure people remain safe while having an impact." Despite the lack of a political opening under President Raúl Castro since he took over the leadership of Cuba from his older brother Fidel four years ago, the regime has unveiled several dramatic economic reforms. These include the birth of a private real estate market, the dismantling of money-losing state companies, and the rise of small self-employment ventures known as *cuentapropismo*. Even the government predicts that by 2015, the nascent private sector could account for up to 40 percent of Cuba's GDP, compared to less than 5 percent today. "We're watching these changes very closely," said Jacobson. "We're as riveted to the possibility of change in Cuba as everybody else. As we watch these things, the possibility for economic opening and freedom is critically important to Cubans. "The problem we have is that they're halfway measures," she argues. "Change is possible and the United States will encourage, reward and respond to change. The way we responded to change in Burma is very instructive, I think. We are not absolutists in the sense that we're going to sit with our arms folded until everything is done." Region-wide, Jacobson said the Obama administration remains focused on the same four goals as when it came into office: improving citizen security, strengthening democracy, expanding economic opportunity, and reducing social inequality. "The fundamental goal that runs throughout all of those goals is partnership," she told The Diplomat. "As the president said in Cartagena, there's really no such thing as junior and senior partnerships. What's new about that is the capacity of our partner countries to act domestically, in the region and globally. Our partnerships include Brazil, Mexico, Canada, Colombia and Chile — countries with strong democratic institutions and the capacity to really bring something to the table that the United States can't." Some of the biggest international meetings in the last year, she noted, took place in Latin America, even though they weren't specific to Latin America. Jacobson also cited a "rare moment of bipartisanship" in the recent passage of U.S. free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama. "Even the opponents of free trade recognize that not having the agreements does not improve the labor or environmental situation," she said. "Sometimes, people have irrational exuberance about what FTAs can really achieve. They're not the entire answer on labor and environment, just as they're not the entire answer in growing trade and exports. They're critically important and they help enormously, but you must also have solid domestic legislation, enforcement and sanctions if people don't abide by the rules." The next logical step, said Jacobson, is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which seeks to eliminate trade barriers across the entire Pacific region. In addition to the United States, the TPP's original members include Chile and Peru, and now Mexico and Canada have been invited to join. In addition, Panama and Colombia are interested in becoming part of the TPP as soon as possible, while Costa Rica may sign up as well. "[If] you look at U.S. Latin America policy since Bush 41, there's been a lot of bipartisanship on this hemisphere. When I go up [to Congress] and brief them over the last four years on the Mérida Initiative and CARSI [Central America Regional Security Initiative], I do not get partisan pushback."

### Cuba removal of sanctions = Free Trade

#### Lifting the embargo increases trade

SAUL LANDAU and NELSON P. VALDES¶ [Saul Landau, Professor Emeritus, California State University, Pomona,Nelson P. Valdes is Professor Emeritus, University of New Mexico]¶ JANUARY 29, 2013¶ A Boon for Cuban-American Entrepreneurs¶ The Economics of the Cuban Embargo¶ <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/01/29/the-economics-of-the-cuban-embargo/>

The time has come and almost gone for Washington to repair its broken relations with Cuba. For 53 years the White House has maintained a punishing embargo on trade with Cuba. Its proponents, with the goal of removing Cuba’s revolutionary government, still plead: “give it time.”¶ In 2001 President George W. Bush allowed for an exception permitting US companies to sell agricultural products to Cuba for immediate payment, although imports from Cuba remained off limits. Other economic sectors received no benefits.¶ Cuban Americans particularly from south Florida now export goods and remittances to relatives and friends while importing profits from sales made to fellow Cubans in Cuba, giving them an advantage denied to the rest of the country.¶ Washington pundits attribute superhuman strength to the anti-Castro lobby; thus no President would attempt to lift the trade and travel embargoes on the island. Yet, Cuban Americans trade with and travel to Cuba freely on a daily basis. The “embargo” applies to everyone except Cuban Americans.¶ This growing international trade, disguised as sending goods to needy family members in Cuba, now includes filling the hulls on 10 or more daily charter flights from US cities to Cuba. Cuban Americans send goods, often with “mules,” to provide family members in Cuba, needing supplies for their businesses. The “mules” return with cash, derived from sales of these goods. Some of the new Cuban stores and restaurants supplied by Miami-based Cubans make substantial profits, some of which get spent in Cuba, and ends up in Cuba’s central bank.¶ Miami, the United States’ poorest large city, derives income because it provides jobs involved in buying and selling the goods sent to Cuba. Jobs also arise from routine tasks created around the daily charter flights to and from Cuba, and the fees collected from take offs and landings. Add to this, the work for accountants, book-keepers and others.¶ Some unemployed Cuban Americans get jobs as mules transporting the goods and money from one country to the other. Miami banks also benefit.¶ In Cuba, this trade also creates jobs and wealth. Mercedes runs a paladar [private restaurant]in Havana’s Vedado neighborhood, “because we draw tourists who like good food, which I serve at my paladar.”¶ Some paladar customers flew to Havana from Miami. These Cuban Americans come to visit relatives and maybe check on their new investments in Havana family-run businesses. “Relatives in Florida supply me with food I can’t get easily in Cuba,” Mercedes said, “like some spices, and packaged goods. I send them money for these products. They make a profit, and so do I. The government makes money from taxes I pay, and jobs grow in Cuba’s tourist industry.”¶ US-based charter flights have full hulls, even those with few passengers. One charter flight company manager told us: “Passengers don’t matter that much. The hull is totally full.”¶ Much of the Cuba trade flows through the Miami International Airport, meaning capital moves from the US to Cuba; most of the luggage contents, however, remain in Cuba. The boon to Miami airport services means jobs, fees and taxes, which remain as capital in south Florida. The goods purchased in south Florida by Cubans (relatives, mules, etc) benefit local businesses.¶ This trade multiplies jobs throughout the area — as well as it does for Cuba: In Miami sales emanate from stores and lead to jobs in transportation, parking, hotel facilities, restaurants, and luggage-handling. Count the businesses providing services to the people traveling to Cuba and sending goods there. Don’t omit the expanded police force, and extra officials required in immigration, and customs; nor fail to consider jobs servicing air planes, and their jetways, and additional personnel needed for landings and take offs, and extra jobs in airport administration and maintenance created by expanded travel. Think of Miami’s increased tax revenues.¶ South Florida represents a Cuban settler state within the United States. It counters its interests against those of the dominant society, with the society’s ignorant acquiescence. The Miami-based Cuban Americans and their Cuba-based families have used US-Cuba policy, the embargo representing the power of the nation for their own self-interest, and in order to attain a comparative advantage vis a vis the rest of the American population.¶ Since 1960, commitment to overthrow of the Cuban government has functioned as US foreign policy on Cuba, a policy now controlled informally by south Florida Cuban-Americans. The Cuban American ethnic enclave assumed the political power needed to turn south Florida into an autonomous Cuban settler state inside US boundaries, so that the embargo does not get applied to the Cuban American enclave. The enclave barons use the embargo to secure, for themselves, a protection of the Cuba trade monopoly. This challenges stated US national interests.¶ Camouflaged by ubiquitous anti-Castro rhetoric, the Cuban American entrepreneurs have manufactured a lucrative business with the island, regulated by the very government they pretend to hate. The rightwing congressional representatives pretend to fight for every law to punish the “Castro regime” while in practice turn a dead eye to the growing trade that helps Florida’s and Cuba’s economy. Preserve the embargo, but make an exception for Cuban Americans.¶ By recognizing the facts about this trade, the White House might become inspired to lift the embargo – a move to benefit all Americans. US government revenue would grow from opening trade and travel with Cuba. In the process we might also regain a missing piece of US sovereignty!

#### Economic engagement in Cuba will be spun as free trade

Luxner 2012 (Larry Luxner is news editor of The Washington Diplomat. 10-1-12, “State Official Makes Her Mark on Rising Western Hemisphere”, <http://washdiplomat.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=8560&Itemid=414>)

In the meantime, Jacobson said the detention of Gross "has clearly stimulated a review" of USAID's pro-democracy programs in Cuba. "For years, the United States has had programs in places that were difficult and dangerous. We have a commitment to continue helping democracy activists, working with incipient civil society, but we'll do that in a way that reduces as much as possible the dangers to people working there," she said. "Some of the guidelines are different than they were before. We want to make sure people remain safe while having an impact." Despite the lack of a political opening under President Raúl Castro since he took over the leadership of Cuba from his older brother Fidel four years ago, the regime has unveiled several dramatic economic reforms. These include the birth of a private real estate market, the dismantling of money-losing state companies, and the rise of small self-employment ventures known as *cuentapropismo*. Even the government predicts that by 2015, the nascent private sector could account for up to 40 percent of Cuba's GDP, compared to less than 5 percent today. "We're watching these changes very closely," said Jacobson. "We're as riveted to the possibility of change in Cuba as everybody else. As we watch these things, the possibility for economic opening and freedom is critically important to Cubans. "The problem we have is that they're halfway measures," she argues. "Change is possible and the United States will encourage, reward and respond to change. The way we responded to change in Burma is very instructive, I think. We are not absolutists in the sense that we're going to sit with our arms folded until everything is done." Region-wide, Jacobson said the Obama administration remains focused on the same four goals as when it came into office: improving citizen security, strengthening democracy, expanding economic opportunity, and reducing social inequality. "The fundamental goal that runs throughout all of those goals is partnership," she told The Diplomat. "As the president said in Cartagena, there's really no such thing as junior and senior partnerships. What's new about that is the capacity of our partner countries to act domestically, in the region and globally. Our partnerships include Brazil, Mexico, Canada, Colombia and Chile — countries with strong democratic institutions and the capacity to really bring something to the table that the United States can't." Some of the biggest international meetings in the last year, she noted, took place in Latin America, even though they weren't specific to Latin America. Jacobson also cited a "rare moment of bipartisanship" in the recent passage of U.S. free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama. "Even the opponents of free trade recognize that not having the agreements does not improve the labor or environmental situation," she said. "Sometimes, people have irrational exuberance about what FTAs can really achieve. They're not the entire answer on labor and environment, just as they're not the entire answer in growing trade and exports. They're critically important and they help enormously, but you must also have solid domestic legislation, enforcement and sanctions if people don't abide by the rules." The next logical step, said Jacobson, is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which seeks to eliminate trade barriers across the entire Pacific region. In addition to the United States, the TPP's original members include Chile and Peru, and now Mexico and Canada have been invited to join. In addition, Panama and Colombia are interested in becoming part of the TPP as soon as possible, while Costa Rica may sign up as well. "[If] you look at U.S. Latin America policy since Bush 41, there's been a lot of bipartisanship on this hemisphere. When I go up [to Congress] and brief them over the last four years on the Mérida Initiative and CARSI [Central America Regional Security Initiative], I do not get partisan pushback."

### Venezuela Economic Engagement = Free Trade

#### Economic engagement with Venezuela leads to greater free trade throughout Latin America- rolls back opposition to Free Trade of the Americas

[JOHN GRIFFIN](http://www.thecrimson.com/writer/1209994/John__Griffin/) [Professor of Finance McCombs School of Business University of Texas at Austin]¶ April 3, 2013¶ Engage with Venezuela¶ <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2013/4/3/Harvard-Venezuela-Chavez-death/>

Admittedly, the United States has good reason to be less than enthused about more Chávez-style governance in Venezuela. [Calling](http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/30/international/americas/30venezuela.html?_r=0) himself a 21st-century socialist, Chávez [nationalized](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/09/world/americas/09venez.html) the lucrative oil industry, developed strong trade and diplomatic relationships with [Iran](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/07/us-venezuela-iran-idUSTRE8060DO20120107) and [Cuba](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/15/world/americas/15venez.html?pagewanted=all), [repeatedly](http://www.cnn.com/2006/WORLD/americas/09/20/chavez.un/index.html) [decried](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/dec/20/hugo-chavez-barack-obama-clown) the United States as an imperialist force, and [cooperated](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/07/us-venezuela-iran-idUSTRE8060DO20120107) with the Iranians in developing nuclear technology. Engaging in petty diplomat-expulsion spats, however, is no way to deal with any of these problems, and it in fact only strengthens the Chavistas’ hold on their country. The diplomatic and economic opportunities that would stem from greater engagement would far outweigh the meager benefits reaped from our current policies.¶ Diplomatically, positive engagement with Venezuela would be a major step toward building American credibility in the world at large, especially in Latin America. Chávez (along with his friends the Castros in Cuba) was able to [bolster](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2013-03/12/content_16300175.htm) regional support for his regime by pointing out the United States’ attempts to forcibly intervene in Venezuelan politics. Soon, a number of populist governments in Latin America had rallied around Chávez and his anti-American policies. In 2004, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and three Caribbean nations joined with Venezuela and Cuba to [form](http://www.alba-tcp.org/) the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America, an organization in direct opposition to the Free Trade Area in the Americas proposed (but never realized) by the Bush administration. Chávez galvanized these nations—many of whom have experienced American interventionist tactics—by vilifying America as a common, imperial enemy.¶ Unfortunately for the United States, its general strategy regarding Venezuela has often strengthened Chávez’s position. Every time Washington chastises Venezuela for opposing American interests or [attempts](http://www.forbes.com/sites/greatspeculations/2011/06/13/silly-sanctions-against-venezuela-boost-hugo-chavez/) to bring sanctions against the Latin American country, the leader in Caracas (whether it be Chávez or Maduro) simply gains more evidence toward his claim that Washington is a neo-colonialist meddler. This weakens the United States’ diplomatic position, while simultaneously strengthening Venezuela’s. If Washington wants Latin America to stop its current trend of electing leftist, Chavista governments, its first step should be to adopt a less astringent tone in dealing with Venezuela. Caracas will be unable to paint Washington as an aggressor, and Washington will in turn gain a better image in Latin America.¶ Beyond leading to more amicable, cooperative relationships with Latin American nations, engagement with Venezuela would also be economically advisable. With the world’s largest oil[reserves](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-13/venezuela-overtakes-saudis-for-largest-oil-reserves-bp-says-1-.html), countless other valuable resources, and stunning natural beauty to attract scores of tourists, Venezuela has quite a bit to offer economically. Even now, America can see the possible benefits of economic engagement with Caracas by looking at one of the few extant cases of such cooperation: Each year, thousands of needy Americans are able to keep their homes heated because of the [cooperation](http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/strange-bedfellows-venezuela-low-income-americans-warm/story?id=18650347#.UU9EnlvwJio) between Venezuela and a Boston-area oil company.¶ Engagement with Venezuela would also lead to stronger economic cooperation with the entirety of Latin America. It was mostly through Venezuela’s [efforts](http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/06/international/americas/06prexy.html?_r=0) that the United States was unable to create a “Free Trade Area of the Americas,” an endeavor that would have eliminated most trade barriers among participant nations, thereby leading to more lucrative trade. In a world where the United States and Venezuela were to enjoy normalized relations, all nations involved would benefit from such agreements.

### Hegemony = Free Trade

#### **Hegemonic Stability is key to free trade**

Kwon, Assistant professor of sociology at University of La Verne, 2012, Roy, “Hegemonic Stability, World Cultural Diffusion, and Trade Globalization”, Sociological Forum, June 2012, Jstor, 7/5/13, JG

Following this narrative, world-system scholars argue that trade is¶ facilitated during the unicentric phase when there is a hegemon that is both¶ willing and able to provide global stability. According to Chase-Dunn et al.¶ (2000:80), hegemonic stability creates a ‘‘peaceful international system of¶ states [so] merchants trade with one another more freely and more often¶ across international boundaries than they can when the system is splitting¶ into warring factions.’’ In other words, concerns over security externalities¶ will decrease during the unicentric period, increasing the likelihood of international¶ trade given the relatively safe and stable world political relations¶ (Gowa, 1989). Further augmenting trade globalization is the general preference¶ of the hegemon for global free-trade policies. Given the superiority of¶ the hegemon’s economy and the comparative advantages enjoyed by its¶ national industries, hegemonic nation-states traditionally push for a global¶ environment of free trade and commerce (Bairoch, 1993; Kindleberger,¶ 1975).

# Free trade Bad - Impact debate

## Generic – Conflict/War

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade causes war

**Davis 13** (Monica, “Will US And Germany Go To War Over Free Trade Spying?,” *Before It’s News*, 7/6/2013, <http://beforeitsnews.com/economics-and-politics/2013/07/will-us-and-germany-go-to-war-over-free-trade-spying-2454550.html>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

The US has been at war with Third World countries for more than 60 years.  Used as proxies for wars with larger communist realms, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Nicaragua, El Salvador and countless stood as surrogates for larger communist regimes. Now, the ideologies have turned toward free trade, market manipulation and resource acquisition. China is making inroads on the Monroe Doctrine, setting up mining operations in South America. And the US is looking to acquire African resources via manipulating military might through AFRICOM.  Where once Germany and Europe carved the African continent into fiefdoms, one has to wonder if the United States is travelling the same road. The high tech American economy is not possible without African raw materials. And, for sure, the so-called Green Economy is dead in the water without them. The race for information and resources has become critical, as the US fights to remain a first world power. Newswires say the US taps more than half a billion German phone calls monthly.   They tap more German phone calls, emails and texts than another other countries except China or Iraq. European “trading partners” are outraged at alleged American spying–which is virtually unlimited.

### FT = War - Exts

#### Free Trade Bad- multiple reasons

**Fletcher**, Adjunct Fellow at the San Francisco office of the U.S. Business andIndustry Council, 2010

(Ian, “Debating Free Trade vs Protectionism”, Huffington Post, March 18, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ian-fletcher/free-trade-vs-protectioni_b_504403.html>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

Let's crack open the intimidating "black box" of free trade's supposedly irrefutable economics. The first problem with free trade is that conventional arguments for it are about GDP. But GDP is not identical with material well-being. Whenever someone breaks a window or gets a divorce, GDP goes up. So even if free trade economics were 100% valid (it isn't), free trade would still not necessarily be best.The second problem is externalities, or when economic value is created or destroyed without a price tag. Negative externalities like environmental damage are well known. Less well-appreciated in the U.S. are positive externalities, like the way some industries open up paths of growth for the entire economy. Free trade can wipe out these industries because it ignores this hidden value.The third problem is the assumption trade is sustainable. A nation exporting non-renewable resources may discover that its best move (in the short run) is to export until it runs out. The flip side is overconsumption, in which a nation (like the present-day U.S.) borrows from abroad and sells off assets in order to finance a short-term binge of imports that lowers its long-term living standard. Free trade economics defines both these problems out of existence by conceiving economic efficiency as merely the optimal satisfaction of consumer preferences, so if consumers *want* a short-term binge, then free trade is "efficient." The fourth problem is the assumption that free trade does not increase income inequality. If it does, free trade may benefit the economy as a whole yet harm most people in it. Free trade tends to raise return to the abundant input to production (in America, capital) and lower returns to the scarce input (in America, labor), so it benefits capital at labor's expense.The fifth problem is the assumption, in the all-important theory of comparative advantage, that factors of production (especially capital) are not mobile between nations. This theory says free trade will reshuffle a nation's factors of production to their most productive uses. But if factors of production are internationally mobile, and their most-productive use is in another country, then free trade will cause them to migrate there--which is not necessarily best for the nation they depart.The sixth problem is that this theory assumes factors of production are mobile *within*nations. Unemployed autoworkers become aircraft workers, and abandoned automobile plants turn into aircraft factories.The seventh problem is that this theory assumes the economy is always operating at full output, or at least that trade has no effect on its output level.The eighth problem is that this theory assumes short-term efficiency is the origin of long-term growth. But economic growth is about turning from Burkina Faso into South Korea, not about being the most-efficient possible Burkina Faso forever. History has shown that the short-term inefficiencies of a prudent tariff are more than compensated for by the long-term spur to industry growth it can provide, largely because growth has more to do with the industry externalities mentioned above than short-term efficiency *per se*.The ninth problem is that this theory merely guarantees (if true) there will be gains from trade. It does not guarantee that changes induced by free trade, like rising productivity abroad, will cause these gains to grow rather than shrink. So free trade can strengthen our rivals.The tenth problem is that, in the presence of scale economies, the perfectly-competitive international markets assumed by the theory of comparative advantage do not exist. Instead, outsize returns accrue to nations that host global oligopoly industries. And free trade will *not* necessarily assign any given nation these industries.

### A2 FT Solves Conflict

#### Free trade doesn’t correlate with solving conflict

**Lindsey**, senior fellow at the CATO institute and director of its Center for Trade Policy Studies, **2012**

(Brink, “Free Trade Nationalism”, CATO institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/free-trade-nationalism>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

Protectionist countries have changed their policies in order to catch up economically with more open countries. It follows that the most important thing the United States can do to foster liberalization elsewhere is to set a good example. It’s not just that free traders have sold their cause on foreign policy grounds. Through linking trade liberalization exclusively with international negotiations, they have actually conveyed the impression that free trade requires the subordination of the U.S. national economic interest to broader concerns. After all, in trade talks countries agree to reduce their trade barriers only on the condition that other countries do likewise. Thus, trade barriers are treated like nuclear missiles in arms control talks — prized strategic assets that are given up only in exchange for foreign assets of equivalent value. (Indeed, in the parlance of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a commitment to reduce tariffs is a “concession.”) With the issue so framed, the military metaphors proliferate. Trade “hawks” argue that relatively open markets amount to “unilateral disarmament,” and urge that we close off access to U.S. markets unless foreign countries let in more American goods. Free traders, by resisting such calls, get cast as “doves.” Of course, the equation of trade with war is economic nonsense. Trade, unlike war, is not a zero sum game: one country doesn’t “win” at another’s expense. In particular, openness to foreign competition is not a vulnerability. On the contrary, it allows a country’s citizens to enjoy the best goods and services the world has to offer, and to specialize in those pursuits at which they are relatively more productive. And the benefits of open markets accrue regardless of whether other countries maintain similarly liberal policies. Nevertheless, free traders have seldom challenged the protectionist misconceptions that trade talks encourage. By and large they accept the notion that the United States is somehow at a disadvantage because most of our trading partners maintain higher trade barriers than we do. Their position is that America is strong enough to “win” at international trade even with the deck stacked against us; and anyway, they argue, broader geopolitical interests — countering Soviet power, and now maintaining some kind of nebulous “influence” — outweigh narrow commercial concerns. Thus, by the twisted logic of trade negotiations, free traders appear to be asking the United States to play by less favorable rules than apply to other countries. Furthermore, the direction of trade negotiations in recent years suggests a connection between free trade and the progressive diminution of U.S. national sovereignty. The scope of trade agreements has broadened far beyond simple tariff-cutting to encompass sweeping forays into traditional domestic policy areas. In particular, efforts to “harmonize” national policies on labor and the environment are working their way onto negotiating agendas at both the regional and multilateral levels. And to enforce these increasingly ambitious agreements, new and more powerful international institutions — most notably, the World Trade Organization — have been created and empowered to pronounce judgment on national laws’ fidelity to international obligations.

## Economy

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade hurts economy – kills jobs and exporting.

Sorscher 6-20-2013 (Stan Sorscher is on staff at Society for Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace SPEEA, “"Free Trade" Was Never Really About Trade” <https://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/06/20-10>)

If trade is good, then free trade must be better, right? So consider this old joke about "free trade." It's not free. It's not trade. Twenty years after NAFTA we can add that it doesn't work. It's bad for millions of workers, families and communities around the world. "Free trade" is not free. Our free trade policy encourages production to leave the country. We've lost millions of manufacturing jobs. More than 60,000 manufacturing plants were closed between 2000 and 2010 as production moved overseas. These costs are real. "Free trade" is not trade. Basically, trade is when each country makes things of value for export and gets things of comparable value in imports. In modern globalization, other countries manipulate their currencies, use tax strategies that distort exports and imports, and apply effective well-designed industrial policies to build manufacturing capacity. They export more products to us, and import fewer products from us. Our trade deficits since NAFTA are over $8 trillion. With trade deficits this large, we are not trading. We are letting other countries produce for us. We borrow, de-industrialize, and ultimately fail to capitalize on future production opportunities. That's not trade. That's getting picked clean.

#### Economic conflicts cause extinction

Daguzan 2010 (Citing Jean Francois, PhD and Senior Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, "Economic crisis threatens existence of human beings" November 26, 2010, Right Vision News, pg online @ lexisnexis)

The financial and economic crisis being faced by the world is in fact a human catastrophe as it may threatenthe well-being and existence of human beings in the globe, said Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan, senior research fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research, France.¶ ¶ He was speaking at a roundtable discussion on ‘The Strategic Consequences of World Financial and Economic Crisis’ organised by the South Asia Strategic Stability Institute (SASSI) here on Wednesday. Former ambassador Tasawur Naqvi conducted the proceedings.¶ ¶ Dr. Jean-Francois Daguzan said that the crisis could lead to violence. Every effort should be made to control it as it may lead to risky and dangerous situations. He said that the balance of power had already changed.¶ ¶ He said that if economic crisis is compared with 9/11 and invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, the World Trade Centre debacle seemed to be a contingent affair. The financial crisis to him was like a nuclear war, which is tilting the balance of power in the world. He said that an amount of $50,000 billion went to the aid of developing nations. He noted the impact of the snowballing crisis on stock exchanges and investment potential of different countries. He said that the crisis also affected stability of nations by impacting equities and stock exchanges.¶ ¶ He said that the war in currencies is the last impact of the crisis in an age of artificial monetary powers of currencies, which would provoke and continue with economic crises within countries. He said that it is rebalancing the power politics in the world. He enumerated Southeast Asia’s economies facing problems in 1988 when China was big, but not enough to become the lone competitor of the west.

### FT = Hurt Economy- Exts

#### **FT hurts the economy in the long run – loss of competitiveness and revenues**

De Miguel et. al, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean,

Santiago, Chile, 2010, Carlos, “The Socioeconomic and environmental effects of free trade agreements: a dynamic CGE analysis for Chile”, Cambridge University Press, June 8, 2010, <http://www.bupedu.com/lms/admin/uploded_journal/The%20%20socioeconomics%20and%20environmental.pdf>, 7/6/13, JG

The chain of events begins with the tariff reductions that generate a¶ decrease in the price of imports. As expected, this leads to an increase in the¶ demand for these products from both trading partners. Two effects appear.¶ First, as imported inputs become cheaper, some sectors benefit from lower¶ costs, increasing their competitiveness and consequently their output for¶ domestic and foreign consumption. On the other hand, some sectors¶ become less competitive since cheaper imports will replace domestic¶ production to some extent. The first effect dominates in the short run, both¶ in production and in exports. However, in the long run, the second effect¶ is greater and dominates the GDP results and leads to a lower increase¶ in exports. Therefore, the impact on production and exports depends on¶ the timeframe being considered. There is an initial increase in aggregate¶ exports that diminishes over time due to United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Santiago, Chile.the equalization of domestic and¶ import prices. Additionally, the effect on current accounts is initially small,¶ but positive. However, the loss of competitiveness of domestic producers¶ generates an increasing negative effect in the long run.¶ The main explanation for the reversal in the long run is that the tariff¶ cut would reduce fiscal income compared to the base-line scenario. In¶ particular, the reduction of tariff-related revenues under the UL scenario¶ reaches 43 per cent in 2005, compared to only 24 per cent in the case¶ of combined FTA EU-USA. This leads to a reduction in public savings,12¶ which negatively affects total investment (−2.5 per cent to −4.6 per cent¶ for unilateral liberalization and −1.5 to −2.1 for the FTA EU-USA). There¶ are moderate increases in other revenues, but they do not compensate the¶ shortfall of revenue from the tariff cutback. This affects some specific and¶ sizeable sectors of the economy, such as construction, which decreases by a¶ similar proportion to that of investment as compared to the baseline.¶ In summary, average growth rates over the period and the final GDP¶ level will be slightly lower than in the base scenario for two main¶ reasons: the loss of competitiveness of domestic sectors due to lower¶ prices of imported goods, and the negative impact on investment of an¶ uncompensated loss of fiscal revenue due to lower tariffs.¶.

#### Free Trade a negative effect- undermines the American people

**Heffner, 2012**

(Thomas, “Why “Free Trade” Devastates America”, American’s Economic Report, May 31,

<http://economyincrisis.org/content/why-free-trade-hurts-america>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

On the other side of free trade, encouraging foreign manufacturers to produce in the U.S. creates a big defeat for us. For example, Ohio and Indiana competed to get a new Honda auto factory. Indiana succeeded. They gave Honda an $81 million enticement gift and other intangibles. Honda said they would put up a $500 million facility to produce 200,000 cars per year. They did put up a facility, cost unknown. And 23,000 Americans applied for 2,000 jobs. Two thousand Americans are now turning out 200,000 Honda cars per year in Indiana which translates to one American supplying the labor to turn out 100 cars per year. One American can earn on average about $50,000 per year to turn out $2,000,000 worth of cars (Average car sale $20,000 x 100 cars = $2,000,000). This may be a simplification, but the American labor cost is approximately 3 percent. Almost nothing is made in that factory. The sell-off of American companies is greatly rewarded by those doing the selling. Given record low capital gains taxes and other incentives, CEO’s and shareholders of major companies stand to gain more from the one-time bonus of selling their company at a massive premium to a foreign purchaser than from continuing to run them on a salary basis. Countries like Japan, Germany and China take great pride in protecting their industries from foreign purchasers. They have government agencies devoted entirely to doing just that. In the U.S., we seemingly do everything to encourage foreign takeovers. Of course, no politician likes being the bearer of bad news. Most politicians are not willing to risk their political careers by saying we must take drastic action to the short-term detriment of many Americans, even though that is precisely what they are charged with doing. “Free trade” is a convenient, well-packaged ideology that resonates well with consumers, and lines the pockets and ambitions of CEO’s and politicians. The result is that nearly 50 percent of all new cars now sold in this country are foreign. Our domestic auto manufacturers are consistently losing market share and teetering perpetually on default. There exists in America, now, a stigma that buying American is cheap, undesirable, of poor quality, and in poor taste. Clearly, the group unquestionably damaged by “free trade” is the American industry in general. As a result the American middle-class that relies on American industry for employment and opportunity is being destroyed and falling further and further into debt. No rational argument exists to continue policy that leads to “free trade” agreements. FTA’s are damaging America’s ability as a country to compete, even as the results of free trade continue to provide cheap goods to American consumers. If we do not reverse this path of selling our assets and borrowing from foreign sources to finance our lifestyle of imports, we will eventually receive a call on our debt and will find our cheap goods cost much more than we had ever imagined.

#### Trade Agreements lack improvements- causes downturn in economy

**Sanchez and Schauer**, Representatives in the House, **2010**

(Linda and Mark, “Free trade agreements could hurt our economy”, The Hill, September 22, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/120231-free-trade-agreements-could-hurt-our-economy-rep-linda-sanchez-and-rep-mark-schauer>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

President Obama announced the formation of the President’s Export Council (PEC) in July, the principal national advisory committee on international trade. As Members of the PEC, we recognize that done right, trade agreements can create jobs, increase exports, and help our economy recover. Done wrong, however, trade agreements send those same jobs off-shore, benefiting a narrow class of investors while leaving American working families behind. After our first meeting at the White House last week, we believe that we should be cautious in advancing trade agreements negotiated by the prior Administration. We believe getting trade policy right is more important than acting with haste, particularly when we are talking about creating decent, well-paying jobs for the millions of Americans who cannot now find them. We are committed to working with the President to develop a plan to help achieve the National Export Initiative’s (NEI) goal of doubling US exports over the next five years. We agree with the private sector members of the President’s Export Council that promoting travel and tourism, reforming our outdated “export control” systems that discourage overseas sales, and training our returning veterans to perform the high-skills, high-wage jobs will all help to achieve the NEI’s goal.While we also agree that negotiating bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements can assist in achieving the NEI’s objectives, we believe that such agreements will not improve the U.S. economy or reduce our trade deficit until we improve certain aspects of the pending agreements and strongly enforce existing agreements. Accordingly, we expressed our disagreement with the recommendations made in the letter from the private-sector members of the PEC to move forward quickly on the pending free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama.At a time when our economy is struggling to recover from the worst downturn since the Great Depression, we caution against advancing these agreements without significant changes. A vital component of an export and jobs creation strategy is a trade agenda that does not repeat the mistakes of the previous administration. We need to increase market access to US goods so that we are exporting products, not jobs. At the same time, we must make sure that trade agreements have strong enforcement provisions that target the most pressing barriers facing American workers and businesses. Specifically, these agreements must be improved to promote robust, attainable labor and environmental standards; make the investment chapter, including the investor-state dispute settlement mechanism, more equitable; and enhance existing provisions on import safety and government procurement. The NEI is an ambitious challenge. By taking a collaborative, public-private approach to achieving the NEI’s goals, we can make significant progress in strengthening our country’s economy and creating millions of new jobs for American workers.

#### Free Trade hurts US economy- beef industry proves

**Ensinger, 2011**

(Dustin, “Free Trade Has Hurt the U.S. Beef Industry”, American’s Economic Report, March 3, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/free-trade-has-hurt-us-beef-industry>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

Mark down the U.S. beef industry as another economic sector struggling to compete due to America’s failed trade policies.A new report released by R-CALF USA found that America has amassed huge trade deficits in both beef and cattle with its 17 free trade agreement partners.In the past 22 years alone, the U.S.’ trade deficit with those partners has resulted in a deficit of $41 billion. By contrast, America’s trade deficit in beef and cattle with the rest of the world is just $20 billion.“This is disturbing because we have been sending more female cattle to slaughter while we’ve been liquidating our herd since 1996, and this additional female slaughter has helped to prevent our domestic production from sinking to historical lows,” said R-CALF USA’s Bill Bullard. “The U.S. cattle industry has not been able to keep pace with the growth in domestic beef consumption, and it is imported beef and imported cattle that continue to make up the shortfall.”In 1985, just 10 percent of the beef consumed in America was imported. Last year, that number jumped to 14 percent.The problems will only be exacerbated if America finalizes free trade agreements with South Korea, Panama and Colombia, according to the report.Currently, South Korea only takes American beef that comes from cattle under a certain age. In America, there are no such restrictions on South Korean beef.“I won’t support (the South Korea agreement) unless we get some access on beef. Something that passes the smell test,” Sen. Max Baucus said.“I’m not asking for all. I’m just asking for something more than currently exists.”The report finds that America’s trade policies aren’t all they’re cracked up to be by proponents.“This report clearly shows that the export hype created by USDA and conventional industry analysts regarding increased exports is based on only half the trade equation – you can’t measure the impact of trade on an industry when you only report and measure exports, particularly when our U.S. cattle industry has such a long history of being a net beef and cattle importer,” Bullard concluded. “Cattle producers deserve much more than the propagandized message that these industry analysts are disseminating in their attempt to persuade them to make no changes to current trade policy.”

#### Trade causes loss of jobs and exploitation of cheap labor

**Cameron, 2012**

(Alexia, “Free Trade: Bad for Us, Good for Them”, America’s Economic Report, August 26, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/free-trade-bad-for-us-good-for-them>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

The natural human instinct to trade is obvious from a very early age. You know, “I’ll trade you one of my Superman comic books for two of your Captain Marvels.” But why do nations trade?

We are told that free trade is the best strategy for advancing world economic development, reducing poverty, raising living standards and achieving world peace. There is a lot to be said on behalf of the utopian dreams of free traders – if you disregard the realities of everyday life.

To say that everyone benefits in principle is a touch misleading. For example, data from the U.S. Department of Commerce shows that U.S. multinational corporations, the big brand-name companies that employ one-fifth of all American workers, cut their domestic workforces by 2.9 million during the last decade while increasing employment abroad by 2.4 million.

Any wonder why 15 percent of all American workers are desperately seeking either full-time work or any work at all?The answer depends on which circles you run in. Economists, businessmen and politicians say technological advances lead to increased productivity, which means fewer workers are needed to get the job done. Yes, we have substituted capital for labor. But we have also substituted cheap offshore labor for American labor. Both strategies have the same result: Americans are losing jobs and their wages are stagnating.

#### Free Trade Agreements cause decaying US market- Detroit proves

**Smith, 2013**

(Brianna, “How Free Trade Agreements Crippled Detroit”, America’s Economic Report, July 8, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/how-free-trade-agreements-crippled-detroit>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

Upon visiting Detroit today it can be difficult to imagine that it was once the wealthiest city in America. Once the fourth largest city in the country, with a population of two million, Detroit is now nothing more than the poster-child for America’s deteriorating economy. Its streets are lined with vacant houses and rows upon rows of dilapidated structures: old apartments and long-abandoned factories and warehouses.**In fact, about a third of all Detroit has now been abandoned, and the population of two million has plummeted to a mere 714,000.** Detroit’s alarming decline can be attributed to the crippling effects of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the flood of foreign-made cars into the United States. Under NAFTA, manufacturing in America has all but been eliminated. In order to compete with our economic competitors, Detroit’s automotive companies were forced to lower costs by outsourcing their operations to Mexico. Essentially, NAFTA made manufacturing cars in the U.S. too expensive. As a result, Detroit factories closed down and jobs were lost. The hard-won wealth of Detroit disappeared to make room for “free trade.” While NAFTA played its role in devastating Detroit’s economy, Japan had their part to play as well. In the 1960′s and ’70′s, Japan steam-rolled through America’s auto-industry with little to no resistance from the U.S. government. It was at this time that Japan entered the U.S. market with their own cars. In fact, our government actually *welcomed* the foreign competition with open arms, so much so that they actually pushed U.S. companies like Ford and GM out of the country! **Our economy is in a downward spiral.** As America continues its agreements with NAFTA and the WTO, and as our government continues to take on more debt, the U.S. will continue to see more and more of its cities transformed into decaying landscapes like 2013 Detroit. It is imperative that our leaders in Washington step up and get us out of these dangerous “free trade” agreements, lest the disease of urban decay spread to encompass all of the United States.

## Diseases

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Disease spreads more easily through free trade

David A. Relma et al. [Professor, [Medicine - Infectious Diseases](http://med.stanford.edu/id/" \t "_blank) @ Stanford University], Rapporteurs; Forum on Microbial Threats; Institute of Medicine¶ [Infectious Disease Movement in a Borderless World:](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=12758)¶ Workshop Summary (2010)¶ <http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12758>

Modern transportation allows people, animals, and plants--and the pathogens they carry--to travel more easily than ever before. The ease and speed of travel, tourism, and international trade connect once-remote areas with one another, eliminating many of the geographic and cultural barriers that once limited the spread of disease. Because of our global interconnectedness through transportation, tourism and trade, infectious diseases emerge more frequently; spread greater distances; pass more easily between humans and animals; and evolve into new and more virulent strains.¶ The IOM's Forum on Microbial Threats hosted the workshop "Globalization, Movement of Pathogens (and Their Hosts) and the Revised International Health Regulations" December 16-17, 2008 in order to explore issues related to infectious disease spread in a "borderless" world. Participants discussed the global emergence, establishment, and surveillance of infectious diseases; the complex relationship between travel, trade, tourism, and the spread of infectious diseases; national and international policies for mitigating disease movement locally and globally; and obstacles and opportunities for detecting and containing these potentially wide-reaching and devastating diseases. This document summarizes the workshop.

#### Emerging diseases cause extinction

Zimmerman and Zimmerman 1996 (Barry and David, both have M.S. degrees from Long Island University, Killer Germs, p 132) EDITED FOR GENDERED LANGUAGE

Then came AIDS…and Ebola and Lassa fever and Marburg and dengue fever.  They came, for the most part, from the steamy jungles of the world.  Lush tropical rain forests are ablaze with deadly viruses.  And changing lifestyles as well as changing environmental conditions are flushing them out.  Air travel, deforestation, global warming are forcing never-before-encountered viruses to suddenly cross the path of humanity.  The result—emerging viruses. Today some five thousand vials of exotic viruses sit, freeze-dried, at Yale University—imports from the rain forests.  They await the outbreak of diseases that can be ascribed to them.  Many are carried by insects and are termed *arboviruses* (*ar*thropod *bo*rne).  Others, of even greater concern, are airborne and can simply be breathed in.  Some, no doubt, could threaten humanity’s very existence.  Joshua Lederberg, 1958 winner of the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine and foremost authority on emerging viruses, warned in a December 1990 article in *Discover* magazine:  “It is still not comprehended widely that AIDS is a natural, almost predictable phenomenon.  It is not going to be a unique event.  Pandemics are not acts of God, but are built into the ecological relations between viruses, animal species and human species…There will be more surprises, because our fertile imagination does not begin to match all the tricks that nature can play…”  According to Lederberg, “The survival of humanity is not preordained…The single biggest threat to [hu]man’s continued dominance on the planet is the virus”  (*A Dancing Matrix*, by Robin Marantz Hening.

### FT = Disease - Exts

Free trade causes disease spread- empirically true

West Virginia University Extension Service [organization run by West Virginia University] ¶ May 2004¶ Free Trade Brings Diseases to W.Va. Trees¶ <http://www.wvu.edu/~agexten/forestry/freetrade.pdf>

Economists are saying free trade is great, ¶ but some of the side effects are extremely ¶ costly. International trade brought us chestnut ¶ blight, which killed the American chestnut. ¶ Dutch elm disease and beech bark disease ¶ also came by way of commercial trade. ¶ More recently, the outcry has been over ¶ Asian longhorn beetles, which threaten sugar ¶ maples and the maple syrup industry. Emerald ¶ ash borer threatens native ash trees and could ¶ end the tradition of wooden baseball bats and ¶ rake handles. Balsam woolly adelgid has severely damaged West Virginia's rare stands of ¶ balsam fir in Canaan Valley. Christmas tree ¶ growers are concerned about seed sources for ¶ this wonderful Christmas tree. ¶ In the 1950s, a new damaging insect, hemlock woolly adelgid, was accidentally introduced ¶ into Virginia from Japan or China. This aphidlike insect is now found from Massachusetts ¶ and down the eastern side of the Appalachians ¶ to North Carolina and Georgia. It occurs in ¶ eastern West Virginia and is steadily moving ¶ westward at about 20 miles per year. The western boundary, from north to south, runs through ¶ Preston, Randolph, Webster, Nicholas, Fayette, ¶ Raleigh, and Mercer counties.

## Exploitation

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade causes exploitation

**PLP 12** (Progressive Labor Party, “[‘Free Trade’ Masks Intensifying Exploitation](http://www.plp.org/challenge/2012/10/3/free-trade-masks-intensifying-exploitation.html),” *Progressive Labor Party*, 10/3/2012, <http://www.plp.org/challenge/2012/10/3/free-trade-masks-intensifying-exploitation.html>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

The term “free trade” is a lie, since it implies that it is only about buying and selling (trade) without hindrance (free). Actually, free trade agreements (FTAs) are a mask to cover exploitative relationships imposed by the more powerful economies on the less powerful — i.e., imperialism. Take, for example, the “United States–Dominican Republic–Central America Free Trade Agreement” (CAFTA-DR). This treaty, like other FTAs, contains malignant elements that are hidden under the benign-sounding title.  CAFTA-DR prohibits any Central American country from opposing an attempt by a U.S. business to set up a subsidiary within its borders, so long as the business meets certain requirements. And if a member country objects that those requirements have not, in fact, been met, that country can be sued by the U.S. business at the World Bank. In 1965 the World Bank set up its International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) for just that purpose, with the participation of almost 150 countries from around the world. Thus Pacific Rim, a mining company, has staked a claim in El Salvador to extract gold. The company claims that its plan will preserve the environment, including the nearby river Rio Lempa. Rio Lempa is the source of livelihood for many Salvadorans, through farming and fishing. The workers in these industries have been fighting against Pacific Rim for some time now, knowing full well that the many poisonous chemicals used in mining will pollute and destroy their river. Indeed the workers have formed organizations and put so much pressure on the Salvadoran government that so far it has refused Pacific Rim’s permit to mine the gold. As a result of their resistance, a number of workers in these organizations have been threatened with death or actually murdered. Under capitalism the laws are designed to protect the bosses and their system. Thus, Pacific Rim and the U.S.-based Commerce Group are suing the El Salvadoran government in the ICSID for lost profit. Commerce Group has already polluted the San Sebastian River with aluminum, zinc, iron, manganese, and nickel, among other toxic metals. One study found that these toxic elements produce weakness, fatigue, rashes, and mental confusion in 60% of the local population, with women and children most affected. But Pacific Rim and Commerce Group are not in business to care about the health of the local working classes. Rather they are in business for one thing only — profit — and health problems are not their concern. Furthermore the rules of the ICSID do not even permit it to consider environmental or health problems, but rather only narrowly defined investment issues. It is likely therefore that it will grant Pacific Rim and Commerce Group the $100 million they each seek from the Salvadoran government, as compensation for their lost profits. Thus does imperialism illustrate the power of the strong over the weak, but only when the weak fight by themselves, separated from the rest of the world’s working class. When workers around the world unite in one powerful force under the leadership of PLP, such struggles can not only be won, but can be transformed into revolution by putting a complete end to capitalism and its current manifestation of imperialism. Join us.

### FT = Exploitation Exts

#### Free trade is coercive

**Garcia 12** (Frank J., joined the BC Law faculty in 2001. He had been an associate professor at the Florida State University College of Law since 1993. He has served as a Visiting Professor at the University of the Republic in Uruguay, as Visiting Professor at the University of Houston Law Center and as the Katherine A. Ryan Distinguished Visiting Professor at the St. Mary's University School of Law/University of Innsbruck, Austria. Professor Garcia received his B.A. in Religious Studies from Reed College in 1985, and his J.D. from the University of Michigan Law School in 1989. He was a law clerk for Andrews & Kurth in Texas and Davis Wright Tremaine in Oregon , and an associate in the Oregon firm Stoel Rives Boley Jones & Grey from 1990-1993 “Is Free Trade "Free"? Is It Even "Trade"? Oppression and Consent in Hemispheric Trade Agreements,” *Seattle Journal for Social Justice*, 10/13/2012, <http://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1605&context=sjsj>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

1. Coercion, Exploitation, and the Terms of Market Access The terms and timing of market access can speak volumes about a weaker party’s capacity to protect its markets from external competition before local industry is ready. Moreover, when we look at which sectors are excluded by whom and why, we get a more complete picture of the weaker party’s ability, or lack thereof, to bargain for what it wanted and needed. To take the agriculture sector as an example, CAFTA eliminates the protections in place for regional small-scale farmers and agricultural workers in several key sectors such as rice and yellow corn,49 exposing them to immediate competition from highly subsidized U.S. agricultural products.50 However, the United States assiduously maintained protection of sugar,51 one of its most sensitive sectors that had been of interest to Central American exporters.52 Moreover, in many of the sectors where CAFTA governments announced victories, their exports had either already enjoyed privileged access under the U.S. trade preference programs, or are effectively blocked by sanitary or phytosanitary measures.53 Such one-sided bargains offer evidence of the disparity in bargaining power that plagues the treaty.54 In order to understand the consent by Central American governments to such one-sided provisions, it may be helpful to employ the concepts of coercion and exploitation developed here. That such one-sided market access provisions were agreed to by Central American governments may suggest a coercive aspect to the negotiation, in which the United States relied on the Central American inequality in power to keep certain options (such as liberalization of the sugar market) off the table while pressing ahead for the concessions it wanted.55 Alternatively, or in tandem, Central American consent can be evidence of exploitation, insofar as the United States relied on the absence of other states able to offer Central America more attractive terms in the “auction.” In either case, the one-sided nature of the market access provisions in agriculture suggests that the treaty may not truly reflect free trade. Even those terms that may at first appear to be U.S. concessions tend to prove otherwise upon further inspection.56 Concessions on textiles have been widely trumpeted as one of the premier benefits conferred on the Central American nations by CAFTA.57 However, the CAFTA textile provisions include safeguard provisions allowing the United States to unilaterally impose tariffs if there is a surge of textile imports that have the potential to hurt domestic manufacturing.58 Such safeguard provisions are standard in trade agreements and, by themselves, do not suggest an absence of consent. However, the United States has already used the threat of invoking this safeguard in an attempt to renegotiate a term of CAFTA.59 At the behest of the textile lobby, the United States is currently demanding either the delay of duty-free importation of socks or, alternatively, the modification of their rule of origin requirements in order to protect the U.S. sock manufacturing industry.60 Given that the CAFTA nations have not been receptive to this demand, it appears likely the United States will invoke this safeguard as retaliation.61The manner in which the safeguard provisions have been invoked in this renegotiation illustrates the aspects of U.S. trade negotiations that jeopardize consent. In this case, under special-interest-based Congressional pressure, the Bush administration has invoked a lawful provision in an unlawful manner, as a threat in order to attempt to force a change in the terms of a previously negotiated trade agreement. Such an attempt to change a previously negotiated agreement is coercive. If this were a case in private law, such modifications would most likely be held invalid under traditional contracts doctrine.62

## Poverty/Developing Countries

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade benefits the corporate elite at the expense of the poor

Roden 7-6-13 (Duncan Roden, GLW Staff Writer, University of Sydney, University of Western Sydney, “Pacific 'free trade' deal threatens poor”, <http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/54454>)

This would give foreign corporations the ability to demand compensation for any expected future profits that may be lost or hindered by national laws. Along the lines of other “free trade” agreements, it promises to shift power even further towards corporations based in the rich nations, at the expense of the underdeveloped world.

**Poverty outweighs all other concerns**

Maguire 1996 ("The Religious Consultation on Population, Reproductive Health & Ethics Population, Poverty and Sustainable Development”, http://www.sacredchoices.org/population\_poverty\_sustainable\_dev.htm,)

Poverty is genocidal and the malignant indifference and masked barbarity that underlie upper class virtue are complicit in the quiet slaughter of the poor. Poverty kills with an efficiency that could only be matched by all-out nuclear war. The wars that we have had are pikers in inflicting death compared to poverty. What war could kill 40,000 infants a day and do so with a silent efficiency that allows the polysaturated guilty to sleep comfortably in their beds, consciences fully anesthetized, with no rumble of distant guns to disturb their rest.

### FT = Poverty - Exts

#### Free trade disproportionately affects the people – exploited by corporate and political elite at the expense of the minorities in the name of “stability”

Shah 3-24-13 (Anup Shah, Editor of Global Issues, “Free Trade and Globalization”, <http://www.globalissues.org/issue/38/free-trade-and-globalization>)

The world is becoming more globalized, there is no doubt about that. While that sounds promising, the current form of globalization, neoliberalism, free trade and open markets are coming under much criticism. The interests of powerful nations and corporations are shaping the terms of world trade. In democratic countries, they are shaping and affecting the ability of elected leaders to make decisions in the interests of their people. Elsewhere they are promoting narrow political discourse and even supporting dictatorships and the “stability” that it brings for their interests. This is to the detriment of most people in the world, while increasingly fewer people in proportion are prospering.

#### Trade liberalization doesn’t increase trade- hurts developing countries

**Begovic 2011**

(Selena, Teaching Assistant at School of Economics and Business, “The Effect of Free Trade Agreements on Bilateral Trade Flows: The Case of Cefta,” 2011, Proquest, 7-5-13, http://search.proquest.com/docview/913401427?accountid=7113)//KC

As trade policies between trading partners are believed to have a significant impact on bilateral trade flows, variables which reflect those policies are usually included in gravity model which estimate the determinants of trade flows between trading partners. In order to capture this effect it has become common in studies to include a dummy variable for free trade agreements in gravity models as a main feature of trade liberalisation. A common finding is that they appear to have significant positive effect on bilateral trade flows (e.g. Baier and Bergstrand, 2009; Caporale et. al, 2009). This positive effect is usually attributed to trade creation and trade diversion effects1. Though previous research on this topic is fairly conclusive, with results varying in different studies from small positive (Micco et al., 2003; Blomqvist, 2004) to large positive effect (Adam et al., 2003, Rose, 2004) of trade liberalisation on trade flows this finding is not universal, especially when considering small and underdeveloped countries like most of the current CEFTA member countries. Subasat (2008) argues that the relationship between trade liberalization and intensity of trade flows is not conclusive and that it depends on the sample specifics. Indeed, sensitivity analysis conducted by Yamarik and Ghosh (2005) suggests further caution about the supposed strong positive effect of FTA on trade than is the literature on this topic. They found that "trade creation result in most regional trading arrangements are not robust to changes in conditioning set of variables" (Yamarik and Ghosh, 2005, p. 111). Therefore, they conclude that the effect of FTAs should be determined on a case-by-case basis. The effect of trade liberalisation on bilateral trade flows depends on countries' potentials and capacities, especially where exports are concerned. Santos-Paulino (2004) notes that trade liberalisation usually has a positive effect on imports and exports, but that in developing countries it may worsen the balance of payment as in these countries imports are likely to rise faster than exports. Other important features that have to be considered and that can disturb the expected effect of trade liberalisation on bilateral trade flows are the historical and political circumstances and ethnic considerations in the countries which are liberalising their trade flows. These latter factors will be discussed in the context of CEFTA member countries in the next section.

## Living Standards

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade decreases living standards

**Sorscher 13** (Stan, staff at Society for Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace (SPEEA), a labor union representing aerospace engineers, scientists and technical workers, and is President of the Washington Fair Trade Coalition “"Free Trade" Was Never Really About Trade,” *Common Dreams*, 6/20/2013,

<http://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/06/20-10>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

The overall result is downward pressure that weakens our political and social values, eroding civil society and public interest in all countries. Joseph Stiglitz, a Nobel Prize laureate economist, calls "free trade," [global governance without global government](http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Global_Economy/Globalisms_Discontents.html). Companies have filed over 500 challenges to public policies under trade agreements. In that respect, free trade agreements serve as a [Corporate Bill of Rights](http://www.tni.org/sites/www.tni.org/files/download/ttipinvestment.pdf). Richard Eskow calls "free trade" [21st century colonization](http://blog.ourfuture.org/20130605/corporations-are-colonizing-us-with-trade-deals-and-wall-street-wants-in) where global corporations and global financial institutions displace national governments when setting policies. Free trade agreements are the [global equivalent of Citizens United](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stan-sorscher/we-decide-how-to-share-ga_b_3185721.html) - amplifying the political influence of the wealthy. [My Congressman made a compelling argument](http://www.rollcall.com/news/worlds_apart_making_sure_trade_policies_improve_global_health_commentary-225237-1.html) for public interest, based on his personal experience as a doctor in Africa. Global pharmaceutical companies use patents to charge prices far above market levels. We expect a public good in return. This goes horribly wrong when millions of people with treatable diseases are denied access to life-saving medicine because trade agreements favor investors over people. This is exactly the kind of question we want elected officials to resolve. That's why we have democracies. Instead, under "free trade" agreements, a trade tribunal will make those policy decisions for us and for millions of vulnerable people around the world. These shadowy tribunals will enforce rules written into "free trade" agreements, which are all about investor rights, not about trade and not about public interests.

#### Ethical imperative to reject

**Andre and Velasquez 92** (Claire and Manuel, “World Hunger: A Moral Response,” Santa Clara University, Spring 1992, <http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/iie/v5n1/hunger.html>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Giving aid to the poor in other nations may require some inconvenience or some sacrifice of luxury on the part of peoples of rich nations, but to ignore the plight of starving people is as morally reprehensible as failing to save a child drowning in a pool because of the inconvenience of getting one's clothes wet. In fact, according to Singer, allowing a person to die from hunger when it is easily within one's means to prevent it is no different, morally speaking, from killing another human being. If I purchase a VCR or spend money I don't need, knowing that I could instead have given my money to some relief agency that could have prevented some deaths from starvation, I am morally responsible for those deaths. The objection that I didn't intend for anyone to die is irrelevant. If I speed though an intersection and, as a result, kill a pedestrian, I am morally responsible for that death whether I intended it or not. In making a case for aid to poor nations, others appeal to the principle of justice. Justice demands that people be compensated for the harms and injustices suffered at the hands of others. Much of the poverty of developing nations, they argue, is the result of unjust and exploitative policies of governments and corporations in wealthy countries. The protectionist trade policies of rich nations, for example, have driven down the price of exports of poor nations. According to one report, the European Economic Community imposes a tariff four times as high against cloth imported from poor nations as from rich ones. Such trade barriers cost developing countries $50 to $100 billion a year in lost sales and depressed markets. Moreover, the massive debt burdens consuming the resources of poor nations is the result of the tight monetary policies adopted by developed nations which drove up interest rates on the loans that had been made to these countries. In 1989, Third World countries owed $1.2 trillion nearly half of their total CNP to banks and governments in industrial countries. According to one report, since 1988, $50 billion a year has been transferred from poor nations to rich nations to service these debts.

### Living Standards – Exts

#### Root Cause of Exploitation of workers is free trade

**Cameron, 2012**

(Alexia, “Free Trade: Bad for Us, Good for Them”, America’s Economic Report, August 26, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/free-trade-bad-for-us-good-for-them>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

But there are some basic objections to free trade, especially when it comes to how gains and losses from it are distributed. Although we are told that nations benefit from free trade in the aggregate, these gains are often unevenly distributed.Cheaper labor, for example, means cheaper goods. But who is going to pay for these goods, if Americans keep losing jobs and the middle class keeps getting squeezed?What does moving production overseas and offshoring jobs have to do with comparative advantage? Or is this really labor arbitrage? Arbitrage is about pursuing absolute economies; it has been around since the time of the Phoenicians. In this case, firms are taking advantage of cross-country differences in labor costs. Thus, U.S. brand names sold in America are produced in China.American employees who lose their jobs are becoming less rich so people in foreign countries can be less poor. In the global aggregate, people are better off, but American workers bear the loss.The gains in trade are often widely dispersed, while the losses are concentrated. The extent to which labor arbitrage or offshore outsourcing is responsible for some of our current labor-arket woes has become highly contentious in recent years.

## Water Wars

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Natural resource conflict is probable because of disparities created by Free Trade

Burger 2011 (Andrew Burger reports on news and events at the nexus of environment, technology, political economy and society. July 15, 2011, “Resource Conflict on the Rise: Free Trade Agreements Up for Vote” <http://www.triplepundit.com/2011/07/free-trade-agreements-resource-conflic/>)

Conflicts between private businesses and investors, national governments and local populations over natural resource use and development are nothing new, but the far-reaching legal implications of Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) have placed the rights of private companies above those of local residents and even national governments. In an increasingly resource-constrained world, that could be a recipe for disaster.

**Most likely scenario for war**

**F**uture **D**irections **I**nternational **’12** (“International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points Resulting from Food and Water Insecurity Global Food and Water Crises Research Programme”, May 25, <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/files/Workshop_Report_-_Intl_Conflict_Triggers_-_May_25.pdf>, CMR)

There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. . He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” “Hunger feeds anarchy.” This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.

### FT = Water Wars - Exts

#### Free trade sucks up water supplies causing international conflict risk to increase over scarcity

Owens 2012 (Brian Owens is an experienced journalist and editor working on the leading science journal Nature and the influential policy magazines Research Fortnight and Research Europe. “World’s water footprint linked to free trade”, <http://blogs.nature.com/news/2012/02/world%E2%80%99s-water-footprint-linked-to-free-trade.html>)

World’s water footprint linked to free trade. More than one-fifth of the world’s water supplies go towards crops and commodities produced for export, a new study reports. As developed nations import water-intensive goods from overseas, they place pressure on finite resources in areas where water governance and conservation policies are often lacking. Researchers from the Netherlands have quantified and mapped the global water footprint, highlighting how patterns in international commerce create disparities in water use. The new study, published today in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, presents a spatial analysis of water consumption and pollution based on worldwide trade indicators, demographic data and water-usage statistics. Arjen Hoekstra, a water management analyst at the University of Twente in Enschede, Netherlands, and lead author of the study, says that water supplies follow the flow of goods around the world. Water consumption and pollution, he says, “are directly tied to the global economy”. However, Hoekstra suggests that water is rarely included in measures of economic and environmental production costs. Part of the problem is that so much of global water use is indirect. For example, to produce one kilogram of beef requires as much as 15,400 litres of water when issues such as grazing are taken into account, according to the Water Footprint Network, a Dutch non-profit organization for which Hoekstra serves as scientific director. Another confounding issue is that global water supplies come not only from groundwater sources, but also from rainfall, a factor that has been largely excluded from previous analyses. Whereas research has indicated that agriculture accounts for roughly 70% of the global water footprint, the new data hold agriculture responsible for as much as 92% of worldwide water consumption and degradation. Precipitation is crucial to food production, says Dieter Gerten, a hydrologist at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany, but it is a “hidden resource” and typically left out of research and water-use planning. Ruth Mathews, executive director of the Water Footprint Network, says that the detailed analysis can aid countries and private firms in understanding the real magnitude of their consumption. Companies, she suggests, often account only for their operational costs. But if an agricultural product, such as cotton or sugar, is a component of a final good, such as blue jeans or soda, “there’s a huge amount of indirect water use”. Gerten describes the new findings as significant in calling attention to “the increasing disconnect” between production, regional water use and global consumer markets. He suggests that countries tend to focus on national resources while relying increasingly on water-intensive imports, effectively offshoring their water consumption. As globalization binds countries in increasingly complex relationships, the risks of scarcity and resource degradation become not just regional but international concerns. Gerten says that future research and policy planning “cannot neglect the importance of these dependencies”.

## Proliferation Bad

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade zones make the movement of nuclear material easier

Times of Israel [Israeli newspaper]¶ January 5, 2013¶ US deports Iranian businessman accused of nuclear smuggling¶ <http://www.timesofisrael.com/us-deports-iranian-businessman-accused-of-nuclear-smuggling/>

US immigration officials have deported an Iranian businessman found guilty of illegally shipping equipment to Iran that authorities said could be used in the country’s nuclear program.¶ Amirhossein Sairafi pleaded guilty in 2010 to conspiracy, money laundering and violating the 1995 Iran trade embargo and was sentenced to more than three years in prison.¶ He was released Thursday from a federal prison in Terre Haute, Indiana.¶ US Immigration and Customs Enforcement says Sairafi was then deported from Chicago on a commercial flight.¶ Sairafi was accused of helping ship specialized vacuum pump equipment to Iran through a free-trade zone in the United Arab Emirates.¶ US authorities say the equipment can be used in the enrichment of uranium, a process that can produce reactor fuel as well as material for nuclear weapons.

#### Prolif guarantees nuclear war

Gareth Evans, fellow, University of Melbourne et al., “Eliminating Nuclear Threats: Report of a Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers,” 12—16—09, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2010/01/22/eliminating-nuclear-threats-practical-agenda-for-global-policymakers/3xt>

3.1 Ensuring that no new states join the ranks of those already nuclear armed must continue to be one of the world’s top international security priorities. Every new nuclear-armed state will add significantly to the inherent risks – of accident or miscalculation as well as deliberate use – involved in any possession of these weapons, and potentially encourage more states to acquire nuclear weapons to avoid being left behind. Any scramble for nuclear capabilities is bound to generate severe instability in bilateral, regional and international relations. The carefully worked checks and balances of interstate relations will come under severe stress. There will be enhanced fears of nuclear blackmail, and of irresponsible and unpredictable leadership behaviour. 3.2 In conditions of inadequate command and control systems, absence of confidence building measures and multiple agencies in the nuclear weapons chain of authority, the possibility of an accidental or maverick usage of nuclear weapons will remain high. Unpredictable elements of risk and reward will impact on decision making processes. The dangers are compounded if the new and aspiring nuclear weapons states have, as is likely to be the case, ongoing inter-state disputes with ideological, territorial, historical – and for all those reasons, strongly emotive – dimensions. 3.3 The transitional period is likely to be most dangerous of all, with the arrival of nuclear weapons tending to be accompanied by sabre rattling and competitive nuclear chauvinism. For example, as between Pakistan and India a degree of stability might have now evolved, but 1998–2002 was a period of disturbingly fragile interstate relations. Command and control and risk management of nuclear weapons takes time to evolve. Military and political leadership in new nuclear-armed states need time to learn and implement credible safety and security systems. The risks of nuclear accidents and the possibility of nuclear action through inadequate crisis control mechanisms are very high in such circumstances. If this is coupled with political instability in such states, the risks escalate again. Where such countries are beset with internal stresses and fundamentalist groups with trans-national agendas, the risk of nuclear weapons or fissile material coming into possession of non‑state actors cannot be ignored. The action–reaction cycle of nations on high 3.4 alerts, of military deployments, threats and counter threats of military action, have all been witnessed in the Korean peninsula with unpredictable behavioural patterns driving interstate relations. The impact of a proliferation breakout in the Middle East would be much wider in scope and make stability management extraordinarily difficult. Whatever the chances of “stable deterrence” prevailing in a Cold War or India–Pakistan setting, the prospects are significantly less in a regional setting with multiple nuclear power centres divided by multiple and cross-cutting sources of conflict.

### FT = Proliferation - Exts

#### Free trade lowers trade controls- creates an opening for black market nuclear trade

Matti Tarvainen [Head of the IAEA’s Nuclear Trade and Technology Analysis Unit (TTA)]¶ IAEA Bulletin 50-2 | May 2009¶ Nuclear trade analysis may provide early indications of proliferation.¶ <http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Magazines/Bulletin/Bull502/50203556163.pdf>

These resolutions mandate the IAEA to investigate ¶ covert nuclear related trade to create knowledge ¶ of nuclear black markets for safeguards verification ¶ purposes. Close cooperation with States providing complementary data is crucial for the success in ¶ these efforts Trade Controls Need ¶ Strengthening¶ Verifying the correctness and the completeness of ¶ State declarations has always been the objective ¶ of the IAEA safeguards system. However, it was the ¶ additional protocol (AP) that improved the IAEA’s ¶ capabilities to verify that States’ declarations are ¶ complete. In parallel with the AP entering into force ¶ in an increasing number of States, the IAEA has also ¶ improved information analysis. The on-going State ¶ evaluation process, established in the mid-1990s, ¶ has become the main process supporting the drawing of annual safeguards conclusions.¶ The AP declarations provide the IAEA with additional ¶ information related to manufacturing and construction of sensitive equipment, exports of specialized ¶ equipment and material for example, and imports if ¶ requested by the IAEA. All this information is useful ¶ for verifying that States are fulfilling their safeguards’ ¶ obligations.¶ However, the State may not always be aware of all ¶ safeguards relevant activities on its territory, for ¶ example in so-called free-trade zones, where trade ¶ controls may be minimal at best. As well, the State ¶ itself may indeed be involved in undeclared nuclear ¶ activities and clearly will not declare these to the ¶ IAEA.¶ Export controls are the responsibility of States. ¶ Information available from the implementation of ¶ the UN Security Council Resolution 1540 reveals that ¶ nuclear export controls are not always well developed and not capable of effectively controlling ¶ global trade in proliferation sensitive goods, software and technology. Other arrangements to curb ¶ nuclear proliferation include voluntary arrangements such as the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) ¶ Guidelines adhered to by 45 States.

#### Prolif guarantees nuclear war

Gareth Evans, fellow, University of Melbourne et al., “Eliminating Nuclear Threats: Report of a Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers,” 12—16—09, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2010/01/22/eliminating-nuclear-threats-practical-agenda-for-global-policymakers/3xt>

3.1 Ensuring that no new states join the ranks of those already nuclear armed must continue to be one of the world’s top international security priorities. Every new nuclear-armed state will add significantly to the inherent risks – of accident or miscalculation as well as deliberate use – involved in any possession of these weapons, and potentially encourage more states to acquire nuclear weapons to avoid being left behind. Any scramble for nuclear capabilities is bound to generate severe instability in bilateral, regional and international relations. The carefully worked checks and balances of interstate relations will come under severe stress. There will be enhanced fears of nuclear blackmail, and of irresponsible and unpredictable leadership behaviour. 3.2 In conditions of inadequate command and control systems, absence of confidence building measures and multiple agencies in the nuclear weapons chain of authority, the possibility of an accidental or maverick usage of nuclear weapons will remain high. Unpredictable elements of risk and reward will impact on decision making processes. The dangers are compounded if the new and aspiring nuclear weapons states have, as is likely to be the case, ongoing inter-state disputes with ideological, territorial, historical – and for all those reasons, strongly emotive – dimensions. 3.3 The transitional period is likely to be most dangerous of all, with the arrival of nuclear weapons tending to be accompanied by sabre rattling and competitive nuclear chauvinism. For example, as between Pakistan and India a degree of stability might have now evolved, but 1998–2002 was a period of disturbingly fragile interstate relations. Command and control and risk management of nuclear weapons takes time to evolve. Military and political leadership in new nuclear-armed states need time to learn and implement credible safety and security systems. The risks of nuclear accidents and the possibility of nuclear action through inadequate crisis control mechanisms are very high in such circumstances. If this is coupled with political instability in such states, the risks escalate again. Where such countries are beset with internal stresses and fundamentalist groups with trans-national agendas, the risk of nuclear weapons or fissile material coming into possession of non‑state actors cannot be ignored. The action–reaction cycle of nations on high 3.4 alerts, of military deployments, threats and counter threats of military action, have all been witnessed in the Korean peninsula with unpredictable behavioural patterns driving interstate relations. The impact of a proliferation breakout in the Middle East would be much wider in scope and make stability management extraordinarily difficult. Whatever the chances of “stable deterrence” prevailing in a Cold War or India–Pakistan setting, the prospects are significantly less in a regional setting with multiple nuclear power centres divided by multiple and cross-cutting sources of conflict.

## Agriculture

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Trade liberalization creates imbalances in agriculture – subsidies and corporate exploitation

Moon 2011 (Wanki Moon Department of Agribusiness Economics, Southern Illinois University, Ecological Economics: Volume 71, 15 November 2011, Pages 13–24, “Is agriculture compatible with free trade?”)

Summary, Discussion, and Conclusion Agriculture is too special to be treated like manufacturing sectors in multilateral trade talks: it produces a broad range of multifunctional outputs domestically; it is profoundly associated with global public goods including sustainability, food security in LDCs, and mitigation and adaptation to climate change; and countries need varying degrees of collective actions to address widely divergent needs from agriculture. The current global governance of agriculture dominated by the ideology of free trade is too short-sighted to effectively address such diverse problems of agriculture that have long-term ramifications for each country individually and humanity as a whole. Taking a broad view of the issue, the current gridlock in the Doha round is a manifestation of the conflicts of long-term agricultural interests among various groups of countries and contradictions between conventional economic goals (efficiency, quantitative growth, low costs, profits) and other values such as ethics (consideration of future generations), conservation of natural resources, preservation of cultural heritage, social equity, and food security as a component of human rights. While the WTO keeps adding special provisions or making exceptions to the principle of free trade to account for such a wide variety of special aspects of agriculture, they are the very causes of the failures of WTO member countries to produce an agreement. This article argues that the agricultural problems distinctive from other sectors should be tackled as primary not as secondary issues that would be relegated to the realms of special provisions subordinate to the mandate of free trade within the WTO framework. 6.1. Incongruity of Agriculture with Free Trade In view of the distinctive and diverse roles of agriculture, Batie and Schweikhardt (2009) identify the issue of agricultural trade liberalization as a “wicked problem” in the sense that it is “highly resistant to resolution” as evidenced through the prolonged WTO multilateral talks. They argue that if agricultural trade liberalization was a tame problem, the Doha round would have produced an agreement long ago.11 They contend that trade liberalization is not a convincing argument in so far as agriculture is concerned. The meager achievement hitherto in reducing trade barriers eloquently speaks to the fact that it is unrealistic to expect for developed countries to allow agriculture to be guided utterly by market forces. Indeed, Blandford (2010) recognized problems associated with relying too much on market mechanisms or on government regulations in addressing the interface of agriculture and natural resources and explored the possibility of cooperation in the form of collective actions at local levels. Hodge (2007) proposed a system of governance for solving agri-environmental problems that appropriately combine markets, government incentives, regulation, and collective actions. While it was needed to discipline the ever-growing agricultural protection in the 1980s in developed countries, the pursuit of unfettered free trade in agriculture over the last three decades by market-oriented reformers through WTO multilateral negotiations was an illusion that has been carried away by the following forces: (i) the intent of the US and EU to use multilateral trade talks as forums to solve their internal problems such as budget deficits, disposal of surpluses, and escalating subsidy wars (Pritchard, 2009); (ii) the desire of agriculture-exporting countries to open agricultural markets in fast growing East Asian countries (McMichael, 2000a and McMichael, 2000b), (iii) the neoliberalism and globalization trends that have dominated economic policy-making thinking in many countries since the 1980s, (iv) the intent of the WTO to use the expansion of agricultural trade as a tool to stimulate global economic growth and not to have adverse effects on liberalizing trade in other sectors (McCalla, 2003), and (v) transnational corporations in favor of dismantling the control of nation-states and establishing a global food system guided by market forces (Weis, 2007, pp. 127–160). Although these forces have collectively succeeded in subjecting agriculture to the discipline of international rules for the first time in history, they have also unveiled the conflicts of unbending agricultural interests of diverse groups of countries. In the end, it is becoming increasingly evident that it was rational to place agricultural trade under international rules, yet seeking liberalization of agricultural trade to the extent of manufacturing trade was a misplaced undertaking. History offers some insights into the relation between free trade and agriculture. After the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 and the Navigation Acts in 1849, there had been a brief period of time in the late 19th century in which Britain and other countries made a move to free trade in agriculture. Except for that, our world has never had free trade in agriculture and agricultural trade policies have always been subordinated to nation-states' agricultural interests (McCalla, 1969, Winders, 2009a and Winders, 2009b). There are few changes/reasons to believe that the states are now unshackled from agricultural interests and therefore can make earnest moves toward free trade.

**Most likely scenario for war**

**F**uture **D**irections **I**nternational **’12** (“International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points Resulting from Food and Water Insecurity Global Food and Water Crises Research Programme”, May 25, <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/files/Workshop_Report_-_Intl_Conflict_Triggers_-_May_25.pdf>, CMR)

There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. . He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” “Hunger feeds anarchy.” This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.

### FT hurts Agriculture – Exts

#### Free Trade causes existential harms- multiple reasons

**Kinsman, 2013**

(John, “Fair Trade More Important than Free Trade”, The Country Today, April 17, <http://www.organicconsumers.org/articles/article_27728.cfm>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

The guest opinion by Rep. Ron Kind in the March 13 issue of The Country Today ("Wisconsin farmers deserve access to global markets," Page 6A) deserves a response. Kind quotes statistics by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection that Wisconsin is the No. 1 producer of cheese in the U.S. and No. 2 in the nation for cheese exports. He lamented the fact that even though we have trade agreements with Canada and Russia "the threat of non-tariff trade barriers, such as non-science based sanitary and phytosanitary issues and protectionist actions, are very real."What Kind neglected to say is that Wisconsin is also No. 1 in the U.S. when it comes to antibiotic, hormonal and other drug residues in our exported dairy and meat products. These drug residues are far above the allowable "safe" limits for human consumption not only in Canada and Russia, but also the European Union, Japan, South Korea and many other countries. But when our partners refuse to budge on these completely justified "non-tariff trade barriers" the U.S. threatens them with World Trade Organization sanctions.Kind's support of unsafe food exports through the likes of the Trans Pacific Partnership and the U.S.-E.U. Trade Agreement will not only destroy the farmers in these countries but also their economies. These forced trade policies are unethical and immoral and are no way to make friends around the globe.Kind should remember that these free-trade deals will hurt U.S. farmers and consumers too because the subsidized dumping by corporate agribusiness goes both ways. For instance, the U.S. has been a dairy deficit nation for more than a dozen years now - in fact, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture we now have more than 265 tariff categories just for dairy imports.One of these questionable imports now flooding the U.S. is milk protein concentrate. MPCs are a major component in the production of glue and undergo no Food and Drug Administration food-safety testing. In 2012 alone the U.S. imported more than 240 million pounds of MPC and casein, much of it from New Zealand through its dairy giant, Fonterra. WTO-style trade deals like the TPP force countries to export and import such products no matter what their domestic needs. Unnecessary shipment of these food items also requires enormous amounts of fossil fuels that add to our foreign oil dependency and worsen climate change.There are winners and losers in all of these so-called free-trade agreements. The winners are the 1 percent of the wealthy at the top, the losers are the rest of us. Why would anyone expect anything but a race to the bottom in farmgate prices, workers' wages and environmental standards by implementing the TPP? We need only to look at what happened in the years following passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement when the U.S. dumped subsidized corn below Mexican farmers' cost of production. Two million Mexican farmers were forced to leave their families and their land to risk their lives migrating to the U.S. in hopes of finding work. In the U.S. thousands of farmers, workers and small business people were personally devalued as they lost their livelihoods in the race to the bottom triggered by NAFTA.

#### Sustainable agriculture requires delinking from global economy – free trade can’t solve

Bieler 2012 (Andreas Bieler, Professor of Political Economy at University of Nottingham, 8-13-12, “Trade Unions and Global Restructure,” <http://andreasbieler.blogspot.com/2012/08/samir-amin-free-trade-in-agriculture.html>)

Free trade in agriculture has increasingly become a focus for discussions about a potential path of development for countries in the Global South as well as a solution to the problem of how to feed the ever expanding global population. Drawing on the contribution by Samir Amin to the workshop ‘Trade unions, free trade and the problem of transnational solidarity’, held at Nottingham University on 2 and 3 December 2011, I will critically engage with this argument. Over recent decades, the WTO has played a crucial role in pushing the debate on free trade in agriculture. The argument is that free trade and deregulated markets will ensure the highest possible levels of production as well as guarantee that food reaches those areas quickly, where it is needed most. A speech by the then Director-General of the WTO Supachai Panitchpakdi in 2005 reflects well this understanding of the important relationship between food security and free trade. ‘It is widely accepted’, he argued, ‘that a further reduction of trade barriers and trade-distorting subsidies will help boost the economic performance of developing country agricultural producers’ (Panitchpakdi 2005). The emphasis on the unregulated, free market is key to this understanding. ‘By allowing world food markets to fix their own prices, we will be inducing more production globally, including from net food importing developing countries’ (Panitchpakdi 2005). Indeed, the introduction of modern technology in agriculture would significantly increase food production. Supporters of such a strategy of submitting agriculture and food production to market mechanisms point to the way capitalism took off first in England and then in Europe more generally. When new social property relations emerged in European agriculture around a landlord/capitalist tenant/wage-labourer structure and both the landlord and tenant depended on the market for their social reproduction, constant technological innovation and increasing specialisation of production methods and higher yields were the result. As Amin makes clear, however, this is not a model developing countries can follow today. Agricultural capitalism in Europe implied an increasing focus on larger farms and new technology engendering a process, in which thousands of peasants lost their land and were set ‘free’. It was a unique historical situation with two key factors, which ensured that the model took off successfully then, but cannot be repeated today. First, industrial production in 18th and 19th century was highly labour intensive and could absorb the peasants driven off their land. By contrast, developing countries attempting to compete on the world market today would need to adopt modern technology, which requires fewer workers. ‘The second is that Europe benefited during that long transition from the possibility of massive out migration of their “surplus” population to the Americas’ (Amin 2011: 17). Any peasants, unable to find industrial employment in the expanding European cities in the 19th century, had the opportunity of emigrating to America in the search for a new livelihood. Capitalist agriculture in Europe, Amin contests, ‘was sustainable only through the safety valve allowed by the mass emigration to the Americas. It would be absolutely impossible for the countries of the periphery today – who make up 80% of the world’s people, of which almost half are rural – to reproduce this model. They would need 5 or 6 Americas to be able to “catch up” in the same way. “Catching up” is therefore an illusion and any progress in this direction can only result in an impasse’ (Amin 2011: 12). Submitting agriculture to capitalist market forces today would imply that the vast majority of the 3 billion people depending on subsistence farming lose access to their land with nowhere to go beyond the growing slums surrounding the ever expanding cities in the Global South. ‘Admitting the general principle of competition for agricultural products and foodstuffs, as imposed by WTO, means accepting that billions of “non-competitive” producers be eliminated within the short historic time of a few decades. What will become of these billions of humans beings …?’ (Amin 2011: 16-17). Clearly, introducing capitalist agriculture across the world would not overcome uneven development between highly productive capitalist agriculture and much less productive subsistence agriculture. Nor would it lead to developmental catch-up. Instead, it would deepen existing divisions and put the already precarious conditions of billions of people further at risk. Hence, only a strategy of delinking from the global economy in general and the global agricultural market in particular can facilitate sustainable development in the Global South. At the national level, such an alternative development path ‘implies macro-policies protecting peasant food production from the unequal competition of modernised agriculturalists – agro-business local and international. With a view to guaranteeing acceptable internal food prices eventually disconnected from the so called international market prices (in fact also markets biased by subsidies of the wealthy North-USA/Canada/Europe)’ (Amin 2011: 18).

## Democracy

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade hurts democratic efforts – incompatible

Milne 2012 (Jared Milne is a member of the Edmonton Chapter of the Council of Canadians, 11-28-12, “Free Trade and Democracy Incompatible,” <http://vueweekly.com/front/story/free_trade_and_democracy_incompatible/>)

Free trade and democracy incompatible. • Long-term, legally binding agreements with multi-national corporations involving zero public and Canadian Parliamentary scrutiny. • Secretive lawsuits of any level of Canadian government by the same corporations if Canadian laws interfere with a corporation's profitability. • Export of good jobs overseas because smaller local companies can't compete for public contracts. Resulting pressure on Canadian governments to privatize our essential services. These are just a few of the negative outcomes of past trade deals like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Canada-US FTA and the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA). And they will be repeated again with the impending Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) and the Canada-China Foreign Investment Protection and Promotion Agreement (FIPA). The Harper government is trying to pass these deals with as little public awareness as possible, even though they will have a tremendous impact on Canada.

#### Democratic decisionmaking is best for the environment, spreads risks proportionately and includes more voices into the equation

[Akash Goreeba](http://www.e-ir.info/author/akash-goreeba/) [writing for E-International Relations, an online resource and news outlet for global affairs] [Environmental Democracy? Does Anyone Really Care?](http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/26/environmental-democracy-does-anyone-really-care/) October 26, 2012

<http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/26/environmental-democracy-does-anyone-really-care/>

It is not surprising that EU policy has placed emphasis on just sustainability a year after and EU governance white paper was produced (2001). In this White Paper, ‘’the modernization of European governance is seen as a necessary precondition for European integration through a process of decentralization, combating the impact of globalization, and a restoration of faith in democracy through wider involvement in decision making’’ (Agyeman & Evans 2004, p.162).¶ We have seen from the above the problematic of environmental justice. It is arguably particularly difficult when considered in the global context. It is not surprising that attempts to safeguard and provide environmental justice have now taken a small scale dimension. An example of a more small scale attempt at addressing the effects on environmental justice/injustice is the Environmental Justice Showcase Community by the EPA (environmental protection agency). Recently it was announced that the State of Jacksonville USA had been selected for the pilot scheme which would see a cash injection of over $100,000 by the EPA which would go towards addressing the environmental issues suffered by low income and minority communities.¶ ‘’EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson announced that, under the initiative, Jacksonville will be one of the national models for EPA’s commitment to EJ efforts. EJ refers to the disproportionate environmental burdens placed on low-income and minority communities’’ (EPA News Release, 04/2010). The project aims at working with the likes of schools, community organisations, local residents, as well as federal agencies. Greg Strong, Florida Department of Environmental Protection’s Northeast District Director stated that ‘’we can achieve much more collectively, when we combine and leverage our resources, than as stand-alone organizations working independently… This kick-off event is an excellent way for us to find new opportunities to work collaboratively with our partners in order to benefit the local community and further improve human health and the environment’’(EPA News Release, 04/2010).¶ Those such as the EJF (Environmental Justice Foundation) have already done well to illustrate the usefulness of small scale local and community projects aimed at addressing environmental injustices, the EJF essentially operates via providing film and advocacy training and empowering ‘’local’’ communities. Some notable examples where this has been successful include the Cambodian Fisheries Action Coalition Team, or (FACT). The Team aimed to resolve conflicts over freshwater fisheries, in short the EJC ‘’ trained and equipped FACT with essential cameras, computer equipment, internet access and GPS systems. And thereby helped FACT gather essential information and testimonies and co-produced ‘Feast or Famine’, which was launched at a meeting hosted by the UK Ambassador to Cambodia and attended by World Bank, IMF and other representatives of the donor community, helping to put the issues firmly on the political agenda’’ (EJF 2010).¶ Other examples include the EJF’s ‘’educating on nature in Vietnam’’, ‘’CEDAC’’ aimed at reducing the use of deadly pesticides in Cambodia, and ‘’JALA’’ aimed at combating illegal fishing and helping poor fisherman in Sumatra. All the examples above have in common that they operated in the ‘’local’’ communities. Perhaps it is the case that both democracy and justice are best implemented at a local level.¶ We have looked at the importance as well as the problematic nature of environmental democracy and justice. As problematic as the two are, their importance are undeniable. There are numerous organisations and NGO’s that are dedicated to ensuring environmental democracy and justice, some of which have been discussed above. In a world where we are witnessing environmental degradation and problems globally, effective democracy and justice is a necessity.¶ Good environmental governance equates to good environmental democracy/justice. We have seen how minorities have suffered disproportionate environmental dis-benefits. In a supposed free world it is only fair that everyone should be allowed to experience both the risks and benefits associated with the environment, as well as future generations to come. And whilst from the above it is clear that environmental democracy/justice has a long way to go, it has done well so far to deal with many environmental issues globally, usually small scale and local. But it is undoubtedly the case that small scale localised efforts are most effective. It remains to be seen whether implementation of small scale localised agendas ‘’globally’’ will prove fruitful. And whilst the likes of Agyeman above, have argued that the majority of environmental issues ‘’fail to register a signal’, this is undeniably changing. Thanks to the efforts of the many who go out of their way to make consideration for the environment a key part of modern life.

### FT hurts democracy – Exts

#### Free trade privileges corporations at the expense of democracy

DuRand 2013 (Cliff DuRand is a Research Associate at the Center for Global Justice. He is co-author and co-editor of Recreating Democracy in a Globalized State, 2-23-13, “Free Trade vs. Democracy: A Primer on the Trans-Pacific Partnership,” <http://www.globaljusticecenter.org/2013/02/23/primer-on-the-ttp/>)

There are many other examples. In 2011 the Canadian province of Quebec placed a moratorium on the controversial practice of fracking in order to study the environmental risks involved. A corporation chartered in Delaware had mining permits in the Saint Lawrence valley that were suspended. Although the company, Lone Pine Resources, Inc., was headquartered in Calgary, it was a foreign corporation. Thus under NAFTA’s Chapter 11, it is suing the Canadian government $250 million for lost profits. Such “investor-to-state” cases are litigated in special arbitration bodies of the World Bank and the United Nations, which are closed to public participation, observation and input. They have the power to award unlimited amounts of taxpayer dollars to corporations whose rights to make a profit they judge have been violated. By latest count, some 450 investor-to-state cases have been filed against 89 governments by transnational corporations who have been awarded $700 million to date. And that is just the beginning. Now there is a new free trade agreement being secretly negotiated called the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP. It has been described as NAFTA on steroids by those who have seen some of its leaked provisions. Negotiations began under the Bush administration and the Obama administration is continuing them in hopes to complete the agreement this year. The discussions include trade representatives of U.S. and Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, Malaysia and Vietnam. Countries like Japan and China may join later. But the public, Members of Congress, journalists, and civil society are excluded. Not even Congressional committees have been able to see the draft text, but 600 corporate advisors have! Some sections have been leaked. And what they reveal is “an agreement that actually formalizes the priority of corporate power over government,” according to Lori Wallach of Public Citizen’s Global Trade Watch http://www.citizen.org/trade . Only 5 of the 29 chapters have to do with trade. Wallach says the rest of the draft “include[s] new rights for the big pharmaceutical companies to expand, to raise medical prices, expand monopoly patents, limits on Internet freedom, penalties for inadvertent noncommercial copying, sending something to a friend. There are the same rules that promote off-shoring of jobs that were in NAFTA that are more robust that literally give privileges and protections if you leave. There is a ban on “buy American” and “buy local” or “green” or sweat-free procurement. There are limits on domestic financial stability regulations. There are limits on imported food safety standards and product standards. There are limits on how we can regulate energy towards a more green future – all of these things are what they call “Behind the Borders” agenda. And the operating clause of TPP is: “Each country shall ensure the conformity of its domestic laws, regulations and administrative procedures with these agreements.” That’s to say, that we’re told to conform all of our domestics laws – including all the important public interest laws fought so hard by people around the country – for these corporate dictates and it’s strongly enforceable. If we do not conform our laws, another country can challenge us and impose trade sanctions until we do, but this one is even privately enforceable by the corporations themselves.” So you can see, free trade is about more than trade. It is about privileging corporations over the democratic rights of citizens and the sovereignty of nations. As the former Director-General of the WTO, Renato Ruggiero, said in 1995, “We are no longer writing the rules of interaction among separate national economies. We are writing the constitution of a single global economy.” [quoted by Jeff Faux, The Global Class War (John Wiley, 2006), p. 155.] What is being created is a global governance order in which corporation are the citizens, not flesh and blood humans like you and me. With free trade, corporations are making an end run around democracy.

#### Fast Track and nature of free trade kills democratic norms

Wallach 5-21-13, (Lori Wallach, director of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch division, is co-author of Whose Trade Organization?, “A 'Legislative Laxative': On Fast-Tracking, Democracy, and Free Trade,” <https://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/05/21-7>)

What do a zombie, handcuffs, a steamroller and a legislative luge run for job-killing trade agreements all have in common? They're all apt metaphors of an expired, scandalously anti-democratic procedure called Fast Track. And, I should know. I just wrote the book on it. How this little-known but extremely dangerous procedure was first hatched and how it has been used to ram extremely dangerous "trade" agreements through Congress over public opposition is a scary story. This is not a book for the nightmare-prone. But everyone else should give it a read, because, gruesomely, the Obama administration and some in Congress are looking to bring Fast Track back from the dead. With a powerful gang of corporations eager to use massive agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), now under negotiation, or the looming U.S.-EU Transatlantic Free Trade Agreement (TAFTA) to steamroll policies supported by the public and enacted by Congress, the threats posed by such an extreme procedure are severe. Like what? A rollback of Congress' recent Wall Street reforms, says Sen. Elizabeth Warren. An undermining of the medicine cost savings of Obamacare, says a groups of state legislators trying to implement that policy. Plans to expand extreme investor privileges that offshore thousands of jobs. A ban on Buy American provisions that create thousands of jobs. Gutting of critical food safety improvements, says Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-Conn.), Congress' greatest food safety champion. And, then there is a backdoor sneak-in of draconian copyright rules reminiscent of the Stop Online Piracy Act (SOPA). Though few would know its name, the majority of Americans have felt the fallout from Fast Track because... drum roll... today's "trade" agreements aren't really about trade anymore. Modern "trade" deals delve into vast areas of Congress' and state legislatures' non-trade authority, and our daily lives. All U.S. laws and policies are required to conform to terms set in these pacts on food safety, Wall Street regulation, access to the Internet, medicine patents and prices, climate and energy policy, health care, immigration and more. In one lump sum, Fast Track delegated away policymaking prerogatives in all of the above to unelected trade negotiators, allowing them to impose non-trade policies, including those that Congress had previously rejected, through the back door of "trade" agreements. In fact, when it comes to agreements that are actually about trade, Fast Track isn't needed. Of the hundreds of U.S. trade and commercial agreements completed since the mid-1970s, only 16 have required Fast Track. One commentator aptly called Fast Track "a legislative laxative that's bad for the Constitution," given it trashes a key check-and-balance inserted by the Founders to prevent an executive branch monopoly over trade policy. I would add that Fast Track is also bad for us. It is how we got into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) -- pacts that not only resulted in massive U.S. job offshoring, but floods of unsafe imported food and higher U.S. medicine prices, thanks to patent extensions buried in the 900-page texts. Fast Track was first hatched by Richard Nixon as a way to grab Congress' exclusive constitutional authority to set the terms of U.S. trade policy and to write our laws. Under Fast Track, the executive branch was empowered to unilaterally choose negotiating partner countries, determine the contents of pacts and then sign and enter into such deals, all before Congress had a vote. And, Fast Track empowered "trade" negotiators to set such binding rules on policies far beyond traditional trade matters (like tariffs), internationally preempting domestic food safety, medicine patent and other non-trade laws. Fast Track then empowered the executive branch to write legislation to change any U.S. law needed to conform to the agreement terms, avoid congressional committee amendment processes and directly submit legislation for a no-amendment, limited-debate vote, which was guaranteed within 60 days of submission. In the era of Nixon, most of what was in trade agreements was about trade, but now Nixon's initial encroachment on Congress' authority has metastasized into a means of "diplomatically legislating" what Congress and the public reject under normal democratic process.

## Tobacco Bad

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Tobacco industry uses free trade to exploit low-income and developing countries – the impact is mass deaths and public health concerns

**ACS CAN 2013** (American Cancer Society- Cancer Action Network, “Tobacco Industry Exploits Trade Agreements,” <http://www.acscan.org/content/cancer-candor/tobacco-industry-exploits-trade-agreements/>)

Tobacco Industry Exploits Trade Agreements There was a lot of coverage of the State of the Union last week; but, one thing you probably didn’t hear a lot of talk about was President Obama’s declaration to focus on trade issues. In fact, in his address the president stated his intention to complete negotiations on a Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) free trade agreement that would boost American exports and economic participation in the growing markets of Asia, and to launch talks on an ambitious and comprehensive trade agreement with the European Union. The president also said that the U.S. will work to connect more people to the global economy, which will help to fight extreme poverty and save children from preventable death. The TPP trade negotiations present an important opportunity to begin, and set a precedent for, treating tobacco products differently to achieve the economic development, poverty alleviation and health goals the president discussed. Tobacco use kills approximately 6 million people a year globally. If this pandemic goes unchecked, an estimated 1 billion people will die from tobacco use this century. Tobacco deaths shatter families, exacerbate poverty, thwart economic development and make it more difficult for low- and middle-income countries to grow in the face of suppressed worker productivity and the escalating cost and toll of tobacco-related disease and death. There is overwhelming international consensus on what needs to be done to address the global tobacco crisis. This consensus is embodied in the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC), the world’s first public health treaty, which has been ratified by 176 nations. Regrettably, the U.S. has not ratified the FCTC, but we are largely implementing its provisions, primarily through U.S. Food and Drug Administration regulation of tobacco products under the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. The Tobacco Atlas, published by the American Cancer Society and World Lung Foundation, documents public health activity addressing the scourge of tobacco products throughout the world. But the tobacco industry, which earns billions of dollars from the death and disease caused by their products, is not standing idly by. The tobacco industry views low- and middle-income countries as emerging markets for their deadly products. And when public health advocates and governments act in the interest of the health of their nations, the tobacco industry and its proxies use trade agreements as vehicles to stop implementation of meaningful tobacco control measures.

### Tobacco Bad - Exts

#### Free trade correlates with increased tobacco use – prevents governmental regulations

**Lester 2012** (Simon Lester is a trade policy analyst with Cato’s Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, 8-15-12, “Free Trade and Tobacco: Thank You for Not Smoking (Foreign) Cigarettes, <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/free-trade-tobacco-thank-you-not-smoking-foreign-cigarettes>)

As efforts to liberalize trade have moved beyond tariffs and quotas and now cover various aspects of domestic regulation and policy, some critics have argued that trade agreements undermine domestic sovereignty. Through today’s expansive trade and investment agreements, critics claim, governments are ceding regulatory space that might be necessary to protect safety and health. As a result, the critics see a conflict between the goal of free trade and investment, on the one hand, and the capacity of governments to regulate for legitimate policy reasons, on the other. As an example, the critics point to the perceived conflict between the goal of free trade in tobacco and the capacity of governments to regulate tobacco for public health purposes. As evidence, they cite two trade and investment cases related to tobacco regulation: (1) a recent World Trade Organization decision that found a U.S. anti-smoking law—purported to be about deterring youth smoking—to violate trade rules; and (2) pending litigation on an Australian law requiring that cigarettes be sold in plain, nondescript, brown packaging, in order to deter smoking, where the complaints allege violations of trade and investment agreements (through the infringement of trademarks and on other grounds).

#### Tobacco use causes millions of systemic deaths and threatens public health

ASH 2012 (Action on Smoking and Health, “Free Trade Agreement Ignores Global Tobacco Epidemic,” <http://ash.org/free-trade-agreement-ignores-global-tobacco-epidemic/>)

Tobacco use is responsible for nearly 6 million deaths per year, and is on track to kill one billion people this century. Governments responded in 2004 by adopting the world’s first public health treaty, the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control. The FCTC has been rapidly embraced, and includes 175 countries, including all but one of the TPP negotiating countries. Tobacco plain packaging and graphic warnings, point of sale bans and bans on flavored cigarettes, interventions found in the FCTC and its guidelines, have been subject to several high profile trade disputes initiated by tobacco industry interests in the past 3 years, causing serious concern in the public health community.

#### Protectionism is better for limiting tobacco use – death and illness are the result

**Lester 2012** (Simon Lester is a trade policy analyst with Cato’s Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, 8-15-12, “Free Trade and Tobacco: Thank You for Not Smoking (Foreign) Cigarettes, <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/free-trade-tobacco-thank-you-not-smoking-foreign-cigarettes>)

Soon after came a State Department cable along the same lines, which set out policy for all U.S. embassies (who sometimes act on behalf of U.S. exporters). This cable provides a bit more background on the thinking of policymakers: Given that tobacco use will be the leading cause of premature death and preventable illness early in the 21st century, there is a need to distinguish between protectionist policies and legitimate health-based actions, so as not to undermine other countries’ efforts to reduce the consumption of tobacco and tobacco products and improve the health of their citizens.10 Thus, while protectionism is an appropriate target, “legitimate health-based actions” should not be discouraged.

## Small Arms Trade

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Small arms trade cause instability and human rights abuses

**Shah 06** (Anup, “Small Arms—they cause 90% of civilian casualties,” *Global Issues*, 1/21/2006, <http://www.globalissues.org/article/78/small-arms-they-cause-90-of-civilian-casualties>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

Consider, for example, the following: Modern conflicts claim an estimated [half a million people each year](http://www.iansa.org/media/wmd.htm). 300,000 of these are from conflicts, and 200,000 are from homicides and suicides. Over 80 percent of all these casualties have been civilian [90 percent of civilian casualties are caused by small arms](http://www.oxfam.org.uk/press/releases/smarms.htm). This is far higher than the casualty count from conventional weapons of war like tanks, bomber jets or warships. [Estimates of the black market trade in small arms range from US$2-10 billion a year.](http://www.iansa.org/media/wmd.htm) [Every minute, someone is killed by a gun](http://www.controlarms.org/downloads/shattered_lives.htm) At least [1,134 companies in 98 countries worldwide are involved](http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/publications/yb_2003.htm) in some aspect of the production of small arms and/or ammunition. Civilians purchase more than 80% of all the firearms that are currently manufactured worldwide each year. There are at least 639 million firearms in the world today, of which 59% are legally held by civilians. Small Arms Are An Ever-Present Problem Some of the factors include that small arms are often Long-life; Low maintenance; Relatively cheap and easily available; Highly portable and so easily concealable. The above therefore makes it easy for things like: Illicit trafficking; Operation by young children. (There are an estimated [300,000 child soldiers](http://www.globalissues.org/Geopolitics/Children.asp) in the world.) Professor Robert Neild of Cambridge University is quite blunt about it, too: It has been estimated that there are now about 500 million small arms and light weapons in circulation in the world, one for every twelve people. Gone long ago is the time when we Europeans could subdue other continents because we had firearms and the local peoples had not. In 1999 it was reported that an AK-47 assault rifle could be bought in Uganda for the price of a chicken. — Robert Neild, Public Corruption; The Dark Side of Social Evolution, (London: Anthem Press, 2002), p. 131 Small Arms Linger Long After Conflicts Are Over And Hinders Development And Rebuilding As the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs describes, [Small arms and light weapons destabilise regions](http://disarmament.un.org/cab/salw.html). This is because they Spark, fuel and prolong conflicts; Obstruct relief programmes; Undermine peace initiatives; Exacerbate human rights abuses; Hamper development; and Foster a “culture of violence.” The Control Arms Campaign also notes that … illicit drugs production thrives on territory outside the control of recognised governments, and 95 per cent of the world’s production of hard drugs takes place in contexts of armed conflict. Valuable natural resources are illegally exploited by armed groups and their state sponsors, ruining millions of lives and impeding local development, as has occurred in DRC. International trade suffers and illicit markets thrive, to the detriment of national economies. — [Towards an Arms Trade Treaty; Next steps for the UN Programme of Action](http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/issues/conflict_disasters/arms_trade_treaty.htm), Control Arms, July 2005, p.8 However, as the UN also adds, “unlike nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, there are no international treaties or other legal instruments for dealing with these weapons, which States and also individual legal owners rely on for their defense needs.” During the cold war, many nations were flooded with small arms by powerful nations such as the USA and the former Soviet Union and their major allies. Even though the cold war has ended, the small arms still remain and help fuel political and ethnic differences into conflict.

### FT = increase Small Arms trade - Exts

#### Trade increases small arms trade

**Shah 06** (Anup, “Small Arms—they cause 90% of civilian casualties,” *Global Issues*, 1/21/2006, <http://www.globalissues.org/article/78/small-arms-they-cause-90-of-civilian-casualties>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

For example, an extensive report from Oxfam in 1998 revealed [that UK involvement in the small arms trade is much higher than previously acknowledged](http://www.oxfam.org.uk/press/releases/smarms.htm). Between 1995 and 1997, UK sold small arms to over 100 countries. “The five permanent members of the UN Security Council—France, Russia, China, the UK, and the USA—together account for 88 per cent of the world’s conventional arms exports; and these exports contribute regularly to gross abuses of human rights.” as a report from the control arms campaign, [Shattered Lives](http://www.controlarms.org/downloads/shattered_lives.htm), mentions. As the report notes further: The lack of arms controls allows some to profit from the misery of others. While international attention is focused on the need to control weapons of mass destruction, the trade in conventional weapons continues to operate in a legal and moral vacuum. More and more countries are starting to produce small arms, many with little ability or will to regulate their use. Permanent UN Security Council members—the USA, UK, France, Russia, and China—dominate the world trade in arms. Most national arms controls are riddled with loopholes or barely enforced. Key weaknesses are lax controls on the brokering, licensed production, and “end use” of arms. Arms get into the wrong hands through weak controls on firearm ownership, weapons management, and misuse by authorised users of weapons. — [The Arms Bazaar](http://www.controlarms.org/downloads/shattered_lives.htm), Shattered Lives, Chapter 4, p. 54, Control Arms Campaign, October 2003 This presents a huge obstacle to development in some of these countries. Furthermore, Control Arms, in another paper in 2005 noted that many countries are invovled in this trade. Measuring SALW [Small Arms and Light Weapons] transfers by financial value [alone] ignores the potentially huge impact of relatively small-value transfers. Assault rifles cost only a few hundred dollars each—but only a few hundred such rifles can lead to major instability, with catastrophic effects for civilian populations. The international arms trade is not based solely in the “North.” At least 92 countries have the capacity to produce small arms or ammunition, and around half of these are developing countries. Some of this is production licensed from manufacturers in rich industrialised countries… Countries which are not renowned for the manufacture of weapons often play an important role in the transit and transfer of arms. For example, Viet Nam has reportedly transferred weapons to Myanmar; Lebanon, Liberia, Burkina Faso, and Niger have transferred weapons to Sierra Leone; Namibia to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Angola; Burkina Faso to Benin. …Thus arms transfers involve all countries, whether they suffer the effects of arms or transfer weapons—not only newly manufactured arms, but re-exported, second-hand, surplus, or collected weapons, and weapons in transit. — [Towards an Arms Trade Treaty; Next steps for the UN Programme of Action](http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what_we_do/issues/conflict_disasters/arms_trade_treaty.htm), Control Arms, July 2005, p.8 A documentary back in 1998, from the Center for Defense Information, describes the problems of small arms as [epidemic](http://www.cdi.org/adm/1216/).

## Invasive Species Bad

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade threatens biosecurity

**Booth 12** (Carol, “FREE TRADE VS BIOSECURITY,” *Invasive Species Council Blog*, 9/6/2012,

<http://invasivesblog.com/2012/09/06/free-trade-vs-biosecurity/>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

International trade contributes to “a prosperous, sustainable Australia providing opportunity for all”, says the Australian Government’s trade policy.[1] Undoubtedly so. But international trade also provides opportunity for invasive organisms, which undermine Australia’s prosperity and sustainability. There is inherent conflict between free trade and biosecurity, and  ISC shares concerns with many farmers that biosecurity policy can be compromised by trade priorities (and not because we’re protectionists in disguise). During the 2008 Beale review of biosecurity, several organisations raised concerns about “potential or perceived conflicts between Australia’s market access objectives and biosecurity decision making”. High-profile conflicts have erupted about decisions to allow imports of various agricultural products, including apples from New Zealand, bananas from the Philippines, and fresh pork from several countries. The government has been accused of sacrificing “quarantine protection on the altar of free trade”.[2]  ISC hasn’t assessed those import decisions, but is concerned that decisions primarily affecting the environment typically receive much less or no public scrutiny and are thus more vulnerable to market-friendly trade-offs. Australia’s new biosecurity legislation (Biosecurity Bill 2012), currently out for [public consultation](http://www.daff.gov.au/bsg/biosecurity-reform/new-biosecurity-legislation/formal-submissions), is unlikely to increase public confidence because it fails to insulate import decision-making from trade promotion. The very person charged with biosecurity decisions – the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry – also has a major role in pursuing export market opportunities. The fact that most of Australia’s top export destinations are also our main sources of imports provides incentive to relax restrictions to avoid upsetting trading partners. Trade and invasive species “Growth in the volume and complexity of international trade, combined with the liberalization of regulatory regimes to encourage trade, has at once increased the frequency of introductions along existing pathways, the number of new pathways, and the ease with which potentially invasive species can move along those pathways.”[4] Invasive species typically arrive either as imported goods – most weeds were imported nursery or pasture plants and most invasive fish arrived for the pet trade – or as stowaways on products, ships or shipping containers. Several researchers have demonstrated a correlation between the magnitude of imports and the number of invasive species and their rate of introduction.[5] Australian imports have surged, their value quintupling over 20 years to $200 billion in 2010, and will continue to grow. International container import volumes are expected to triple from 3.3 million TEUs (Twenty Foot Equivalent Units) in 2010 to 9.1 million in 2030. This means that unless biosecurity is considerably improved, Australia’s invasive species burden will also inevitably grow.

### FT increases spread of Invasive Species - Exts

#### Free trade allows invasive species

**Espie 12** (Matthew, “Biodiversity in the Fray: The European Union’s Struggle to Protect a Shared Resource,” Spring 2012, <http://aladinrc.wrlc.org/bitstream/handle/1961/10529/Espie,%20Matthew%20-%20Spring%2012.pdf?sequence=1>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

Invasive Species Throughout the world, invasive species are brought by trade. Through ships, planes, and other cargo, species manage to stow away.13 Through this trade, invasive species arrive in a new ecosystem and spread, decimating populations of native species, thereby destroying biodiversity. These species include animal, plant, fungus, and more. As with all invasive species, they bring pathogens and other methods for destroying native populations. In The Journal of Applied Ecology, Philip Hulme declared that in recent decades, “the world has entered a new phase in the magnitude and diversity of biological invasions: the Era of Globalization.”14 The worldwide increase in trade brings with it invasive species, and according to the ecological economist’s perspective, trade is another key reason why biodiversity loss occurs. The invasive species brought by trade are ravaging the land and preventing native species from thriving. Though an unintended consequence of international trade, the most prolific way that diseases and invasive species are spread is trade. The problem of invasive species is continuing to expand with ever-greater trade volumes. The argument for free trade is that it promotes specialization, comparative advantage, and a general increase in well being for all countries involved. The globalized world makes powerful incentives for free trade. However when biodiversity is concerned, scholars point out that trade is one of the leading causes of biodiversity loss because of its tendency to introduce invasive species. These species are accidentally brought to new regions and if they are not discovered and eliminated, they can decimate existing populations of native species. This reduces an ecosystem’s ability to function correctly and it also reduces its ability to provide the ecosystem services upon which society relies. In this case, when invasive species are brought as an externality of trade, market imbalances could be regulated by tariffs, which might prevent such influx of invasive species.15 According to this argument by Margolis, Shogren, & Fischer, protection akin to protectionism needs to be allowed when it is protecting biodiversity (this would differ from protectionism for domestic business). The World Trade Organization allows protectionism in certain cases when national interests are concerned, and environmentalists often want tariffs or other methods to prevent importation of products that are environmentally harmful in production, but this is not always the case as it can be a contentious issue when the exporting countries accuse the importing countries of establishing unfair trade barriers.

#### Invasive species devastate biodiversity and the economy

**Eur 13** (“‘Alien’ wildlife in Europe wreak €12 billion damage a year: study,” *Eur News & Policy Debates*, 2/22/2013,

<http://www.euractiv.com/climate-environment/alien-wildlife-europe-wreak-12-d-news-518007>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

More than 10,000 'alien' species have gained a foothold in Europe, from Asian tiger mosquitoes to North American ragweed, and at least 1,500 are known to be harmful, the European Environment Agency (EEA) said. "In many areas, ecosystems are weakened by pollution, climate change and fragmentation. Alien species invasions are a growing pressure on the natural world which are extremely difficult to reverse," said Jacqueline McGlade, head of the EEA. Introduced species that suddenly thrive in a new home in Europe, including parakeets from Africa or water hyacinth from the Amazon, were estimated to cost Europe at least €12 billion a year, [according to the 118-page study](http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/impacts-of-invasive-alien-species). "Our number is an underestimate," said Piero Genovesi, a lead author at the Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, adding that it omitted the impacts of many species such as tropical ‘killer algae’ in the Mediterranean. "The problem has exploded in the last 100 years," he said. Europe had the most data but the problem was worsening worldwide, he said. And more travel, trade and climate change were likely to aggravate the invasions. "Invasive species pose greater risks than previously thought for biodiversity, human health and economies," the EEA said.

## Human Trafficking

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade creates openings for human trafficking to fill worker demands- FTA structures aren’t designed to stop this exploitation

Claudine Chastain [J.D. (2006), Washington University School of Law] 2006¶“FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING”¶ WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY GLOBAL STUDIES LAW REVIEW [VOL. 5:587]¶ THE NEXUS BETWEEN FREE TRADE ¶ AGREEMENTS AND THE TRAFFICKING OF ¶ HUMAN BEINGS¶ <http://law.wustl.edu/wugslr/issues/volume5_3/p587chastain.pdf>

After the failure of the 2003 World Trade Organization (WTO) ¶ Ministerial meeting1¶ in Cancun, Mexico, the Bush Administration ¶ emphasized its intention to aggressively pursue bilateral and regional freetrade agreements.2¶ As former United States Trade Representative (USTR), ¶ Robert Zoellick stated, “[w]e are going to keep trying to open markets one ¶ way or the other.”3¶ Free trade agreements4¶ (FTAs) are important elements ¶ of U.S. trade policy, which utilize an approach called competitive ¶ liberalization.5¶ The Bush Administration views FTAs as part of its strategy ¶ to enhance prosperity and stability within the world.6 FTAs between developed countries may have the power to raise ¶ standards of living, to improve working conditions, and to increase ¶ environmental protections;7¶ however, such agreements between developed ¶ and developing countries exacerbate existing deficiencies within the ¶ developing nations. Without the proper infrastructure, people within ¶ developing countries fall susceptible to exploitation. If countries choose to ¶ engage in negotiations, protections need to be built into the framework of ¶ the agreement.8¶ At a minimum, such protections should include the ¶ delineation and enforcement of labor standards, the implementation and ¶ enforcement of anti-trafficking laws, and assistance for citizens whose ¶ livelihoods are affected by globalization and the transition to market ¶ economies.9¶ FTAs should also include enforcement mechanisms that can ¶ adequately deal with such violations.10¶ The purported goals of FTAs between developed and developing ¶ countries are laudable—everyone would like to see democracy furthered, ¶ the rule of law upheld, and standards of living raised. These, however, are ¶ long-term objectives. Structural changes within developed countries have ¶ led to a more service-oriented economy and these countries now outsource ¶ much of the labor-intensive sector to developing countries.11 While ¶ proponents of labor rights fear that the search for competitiveness will ¶ favor the exploitation of cheap labor in substandard conditions,12¶ proponents of FTAs state that over-regulation can create serious market ¶ distortions that cause other ripple effects, including job loss and economic ¶ stagnation.13

Trafficking is akin to slavery and dehumanization

Enriquez, 1999 (Jean, Director of the Coalition Against the Trafficking of Women in the Asia Pacific, November,

“Filipinas in Prostitution around U.S. Military Bases in Korea: A Recurring Nightmare”, http://www.catw-ap.org/resources/speeches-papers/filipinas-in-prostitution-around-us-military-bases-in-korea-a-recurring-nightmare/)

CATW asserts that trafficking in women is inseparable with the issue of prostitution. The gender-based nature of trafficking exposes itself as serving the purpose of ensuring the steady supply of women to areas where men demand sexual services. We deplore trafficking and prostitution as violations of women’s human rights. We cannot consider it work, because among others, it compels women to perform acts that denigrates their person — their integrity as human beings. The impact to women of sexual exploitation is hardly healed by time. Amerasian children, estimated at 30,000, were born to Filipinas prostituted around the U.S. military bases in the Philippines. They receive no assistance from either the U.S. or Philippine government. Economically, ‘working in the clubs’ meant irregular earnings and slavery, as many of them would be withheld of their salaries or are fined for any ‘misconduct’. The women were abused physically, psychologically and emotionally. Some were murdered. With the Visiting Forces Agreement recently signed between the Philippine and U.S. governments, 22 ports will be opened to foreign troops and more women will be abused in the remote rural areas of the country. In Korea, our women are once again subjected to the same brutality. The same experiences continue to haunt our women. In Korea, the Philippines and elsewhere, the women are viewed as commodities to be bought, and being Asians, they are certainly perceived as less than human.

### FT = increase human trafficking/sex trafficking - Exts

#### Free trade causes human trafficking

**Matarrese 13** (Andy, “Human trafficking is here in Central Washington,” *Daily Record*, 3/1/2013,

<http://www.dailyrecordnews.com/paywall/top_story/human-trafficking-is-here-in-central-washington/article_caaa89c0-82a2-11e2-b109-0019bb2963f4.html>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

Modern day slavery Conner, along with others who combat in human trafficking, spoke Wednesday night and again at Hal Holmes Community Center Thursday to explain the nuances of human trafficking and modern-day slavery. The sex trade is just one part of the world of human trafficking, said Bill Forbes, another panelist and the director of child protection for World Vision International, a relief organization. Movies like “Taken” and the dramatic image of sinister-looking men coercing women and children into sex trafficking have garnered a lot of attention, he said. “And it should … but they give a very narrow, and actually, in my experience, quite a distorted view of the issue, and as in most things Hollywood, we don’t get a complete picture by watching the dashing man with a gun running around solving problems,” he said. “The true picture of trafficking is much more subtle, more hidden and often not as well understood.” Not just about sex Forbes offered a global perspective on the problem. Yes, a lot of human trafficking revolves around sex work, he said, but it would be a misconception to say that’s all of it, he said.  The United Nations estimates that 79 percent of all human trafficking worldwide is for sexual exploitation, but it’s hard to say anything for sure about the length and breadth of trafficking. By its nature, it is done in the dark and it is often misidentified or misunderstood by both victims and authorities. “Because the crime is so hidden and invisible, there’s no confidence that we know the whole picture in a given city, state and certainly not internationally,” he said, and any data about trafficking should be taken with a grain of salt. Men and boys, women and girls are all trafficked for different reasons, he said. They might be coerced into working in manufacturing, agriculture, hotels and hospitality, as maids and janitors, in mines or mills, or a child soldiers. In some places, he said, even street beggars might be forced into their line of work. Part of the confusion comes from trouble defining the crime, he said. To paraphrase the UN’s definition, it’s the recruitment, movement, harboring or receipt of others through fraud, coercion or force for the purpose of exploiting them or otherwise compelling them to work against their will. The State Department estimates that 20 million to 27 million people have been victims of human trafficking, and different UN estimates say it’s anywhere from a $5 billion to $32 billion industry. “Trafficking at its core is about money,” he said. “It’s not about sex, it’s not about lust, it’s not about image. It’s about money.” Causes and targets Traffickers, Forbes said, tend to target individuals from vulnerable groups, dysfunctional or disrupted families or who are poor, disabled or homeless. Forbes said the environment where trafficking comes from often begets other crimes. Places where poverty, discrimination, conflict, corruption and high rates of migration are common are areas for trafficking. Laws that address domestic violence or labor or sexual exploitation just scratch the surface, said Velma Veloria, chairwoman of the University of Washington’s Women’s Center Anti Human Trafficking Task Force and former Washington state representative. Veloria sponsored a bill in 2003 that made Washington the first state to pass laws combating human trafficking. “This whole issue is not an accident,” she said when she spoke Wednesday. She said the competition to provide cheap goods to developed nations has put workers in the rest of the world at greater risk of exploitation and suffering. Free trade treaties and international trade agreements like the one the U.S. is pursuing with Japan and other Pacific nations could add to the problem. “There’s nothing in there that talks about workers’ standard of living, there’s nothing in there that talks about even a minimum wage,” she said. “There’s nothing in there that talks about, what kind of economic development can we produce?” She recalled cases of what looked like domestic violence turning into something far darker.

This is a good old fashioned Decision Rule—we must place values over survival, especially in the context of contemporary human slavery that takes the form of human trafficking

Schmitz, 2004 (Joseph E., Inspector General of the Department of Defense, “Implementing the Department of Defense

“Zero Tolerance” Policy With Regard to Trafficking in Humans”, http://www.dodig.mil/fo/JES\_TIP\_Testimony\_092104.pdf)

A more fundamental answer might be that to confront modern day human slavery forces us all to focus on “first things first,” that is, we need to focus on the principles that are worth fighting for, in order that we might better focus on “second things,” which include survival. “[T]he principle of ‘first and second things,’ as C. S. Lewis calls it . . . [is] that when second things are put first, not only first things but second things too are lost. More exactly, when there are greater goods, or ultimate ends and proximate ends, if we put lesser goods, like survival, before greater goods, like values to survive for, then we lose not only the greater goods, the values, but even the lesser goods that we’ve idolized . . . . [T]he society that believes in nothing worth surviving for beyond mere survival will not survive.”5 Our currently available legislative tools for suppressing human trafficking include, of course, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 and its 2003 reauthorization, which together prescribe a model “zero tolerance” standard not only for all Americans but for our Western Alliance partners as well. There is another legislative tool for combating trafficking in persons, less known but equally potent for those of us serving in the Department of Defense, known as the “Exemplary Conduct” leadership standard.

## Drug Trafficking

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### **Free trade increases drug trade**

**Arnoldi and Olear 13** (Katie and Greg, “THE MEXICAN CONNECTION, PART II: INHUMAN TRAFFICKING,” *The Weeklings*, 3/19/2013,

<http://www.theweeklings.com/kago/2013/03/19/the-mexican-connection-part-ii-inhuman-trafficking/>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

[GO]: But that’s not the whole story. There’s also the part about how the law has been a boon to the cartels. [KA]: NAFTA has been great for the drug business. In rural Mexico, you’ve got all these farmers desperate to feed their families. Cartel guys come in and say, “Forget corn.  Grow our weed. We’ll pay you way more money than you’ve ever made before. And if you say no, we’ll rape your children and cut your head off.” No one says NO. Marijuana production has exploded. And up in the mountains there has been an increase in the cultivation of poppies for heroin. But the best thing that NAFTA did for the drug trafficking organizations was to open up the shipping options. According to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, in 2011 we had 4,858,057 trucks cross from Mexico into the United States. That’s almost five million trucks. In that same year, 61,180,268 passenger cars crossed our border. The sheer volume of traffic makes it impossible for border agents to thoroughly check each vehicle, especially the big shipping containers. I’ve read that as few as 5% of commercial trucks are actually inspected. Do the math. NAFTA presented the cartels with an extremely efficient way to deliver product to the customer. [GO]: If I didn’t know better, I would have thought the cartels drafted the legislation. Wait…they didn’t, did they? [KA]: NAFTA was a dream come true for drug trafficking organizations. With our free trade agreement we effectively created a new work force for the drug cartels and an economical way to deliver merchandise. And just so we’re clear, we are the customer. The United States of America is the target audience. We are the whole reason for this big mess. WE DID THIS. Without our insatiable need for intoxicants and our ridiculous anti-drug laws there would be no drug war. We are the sole source of fuel for this terrible fire.

#### Drug cartel violence kills many – brutal deaths

**AP 12** (“Nameless bodies pile up in drug cartel violence,” *Daily News*, 7/24/2012, <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/nameless-bodies-pile-drug-cartel-violence-article-1.1120726>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

MEXICO CITY — After police found 49 dismembered bodies strewn on a Mexican highway leading to the Texas border, it took the army just a week to parade an alleged drug trafficker before journalists as the man who purportedly oversaw the body dump. Yet two months after the grisly discovery in Nuevo Leon state, authorities have not identified a single victim. The 49 bodies now appear headed for an increasingly common fate in this drug war-wracked country: They could join the growing ranks of the unidentified dead. That group has become legion as nearly 16,000 bodies remain unidentified, says the National Human Rights Commission, an independent government agency. In total, 24,000 people have been reported missing. Many say the country’s police are simply overwhelmed by the number of drug war casualties as they struggle with poor forensic capabilities and the reluctance of some witnesses and victims’ relatives to help. That apparent futility is drawing increasing criticism from Mexicans weary of the government-led offensive against drug cartels, who are also fighting among themselves. The violence in total has claimed at least 47,000 victims since President Felipe Calderon launched his anti-cartel campaign in late 2006. “The level of violence we’re living with reflects the critical condition our institutions are in, and it reveals a corrupt government,” said Blanca Martinez of the Fray Juan de Larios human rights center in the northern border state of Coahuila. Hundreds of people have gone missing in Coahuila since 2009, when violence started to erupt in northeastern Mexico. The most recent discovery of corpses shows just how hard it is to put names to often heavily mutilated bodies. Although the 49 corpses all lacked heads, hands and feet, police performed DNA tests on them and compared the results, without luck, to hundreds of Mexicans reported missing. The authorities captured Daniel Elizondo, the alleged cell leader for the hyper-violent Zetas drug cartel, and pinned the atrocity on him. But he and two other suspects arrested in the case apparently haven’t offered any information that could help investigators. The army has said Elizondo claims he was given the bodies by someone else. The bodies of the 43 men and six women remain at a morgue in the industrial city of Monterrey where they’re marked “N.N.” — the Spanish initials for “No Nombre,” or No Name. They’ve also been given numbers as IDs, a state police spokeswoman said. Authorities believe the bodies were signs of yet another battle between the Zetas and their rival Gulf and Sinaloa cartels. Now it’s up to the lead investigator to decide how long the bodies will remain at the morgue before they’re wrapped in blankets and buried side by side in common graves in cemeteries throughout Monterrey’s metropolitan area, said the police spokeswoman, who would not allow her name to be used under official policy. The bodies can stay in the morgue for a maximum of four months. By custom, Mexicans usually bury their dead within 48 hours. Anguished relatives of the missing said they suffer in limbo awaiting any information about their loved ones. “When they took my son, they destroyed me,” said Maximina Hernandez, a 44-year-old maid from the Monterrey suburb of Santa Catarina whose police officer son was taken by gunmen minutes after ending a work shift in 2007. “The only thing I ask God is for some news, to know where he is. But there is no progress; there is nothing.” Hernandez has joined other people with missing relatives to push authorities to investigate the cases but said she’s been disappointed by the results so far. She said police took DNA samples from her and her son’s father but never followed up on her suspicion that her 23-year-old son’s commander was involved in his disappearance. Last year, authorities detained the police commander along with more than 40 Santa Catarina police officers for allegedly working for the Zetas. Luis Garcia, an investigator with the National Human Rights Commission, said the number of unidentified bodies continues to grow, as has the number of missing persons. The commission listed 8,898 unidentified bodies from 2000 to 2005; that number had since jumped by 80 percent as of June. The number of missing people reported in the earlier period, 5,397, has grown even more dramatically, by nearly 350 percent. No one knows exactly how many of those unidentified bodies were killed in drug-related violence or how many people are missing at the hands of cartels because such a study has never been done, Garcia said.

### FT = Drug Trafficking

#### **Free trade increases drug trade**

**Cáceres 13** (Marco, “The Darker Side of Free Trade,” *Huffington Post*, 2/28/2013,

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/marco-caceres/darker-side-free-trade_b_2774190.html>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

Ever since the Clinton Administration signed the "free trade" agreement with Mexico and Canada in 1994, trade with Mexico has boomed. The whole point of this neoliberal policy was to reduce or eliminate tariffs and allow the exchange of goods and services to flow freely. It worked. However, as Dustin Ensinger wrote in an article for Economy in Crisis in 2010 titled "[NAFTA Fueling Drug Trade](http://economyincrisis.org/content/nafta-fueling-drug-trade)": "Unfortunately, many of the goods entering America from Mexico are illegal drugs, the trafficking of which was made easier by the trade pact." Mr. Ensinger quotes John Burnett who [wrote](http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=131106638) on National Public Radio online, "With a billion dollars worth of cargo crossing the U.S.-Mexico border every day, free trade is one of the greatest gifts for drug traffickers." Mr. Ensinger further writes: "This fiscal year, 4.7 million commercial vehicles have crossed into America from Mexico. Only one in five of those vehicles is stopped and checked. Even with such a low inspection rate, thus far in the year, inspection agents have already seized 96 tons of marijuana. According to NPR, some of the drivers are unwilling participants, others are paid to smuggle the drugs. Apparently, Mexico's drug cartels have infiltrated trucking companies and manufacturing facilities across Mexico." Lastly, Mr. Ensinger notes, "Fueled by easy access because of NAFTA, the Mexican drug trade has made a handful of drug kingpins as powerful as any government official in Mexico. It has also led to widespread violence, which is beginning to spread over the Mexican border into the U.S." Consider, for a moment, the irony of it all. The U.S. government is [spending billions of dollars](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2011/06/26/90b_spent_on_border_security_with_mixed_results/) (more than $90 billion over the past decade) on border security to prevent people from Central America and Mexico from entering the U.S. illegally. It is spending hundreds of millions of dollars more to deport undocumented immigrants. It has thus far [spent](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2013/02/central-america-drug-war/) about $100 million to fight the "drug war" in Central America, and will likely spend hundreds of millions more over the next few years. But with the NAFTA in place, the U.S. is actually enabling the organized crime syndicates, drug cartels, and gangs that thrive off the illegal drug trade. NAFTA allows the relatively easy entrance of their precious product. It is through this enablement that these criminal groups are empowered to terrorize the people of Central America and Mexico, forcing them to emigrate to the U.S. In the meantime, the U.S. is being saturated with endless quantities of illegal drugs. With so much volume, the street price of pot, cocaine, and synthetics has plummeted, making it easier for people, particularly young adults and children, to purchase. NAFTA is killing, maiming, and displacing hundreds of thousands of people in Central America and Mexico... and the U.S. And it is costing U.S. taxpayers plenty at a time when Congress and the Obama Administration are bickering about how to reduce spending (before the U.S. goes the way of Greece) and the baby boomers are [retiring](http://www.pewresearch.org/daily-number/baby-boomers-retire/) at a rate of 10,000 people per day, swiftly reducing the size of the U.S. tax revenue base.

#### Drug cartel violence escalates and spills over

**Potter 13** (Matt, “Drug war spillover at border "highly underreported," says GAO,” *San Diego Reader*, 3/1/2013, <http://www.sandiegoreader.com/weblogs/news-ticker/2013/mar/01/drug-war-spillover-at-border-highly-underreported-/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Heads are rolling and bullets flying in the United States-assisted drug war south of the border, but - so far at least - stateside collateral damage has been minimal, if "highly underreported." And getting drug war soldiers and victims to talk can be nearly impossible: FBI officials cautioned that drug cartel related crimes, such as kidnappings and home invasions, are highly underreported and are not captured in national crime statistics. For example, law enforcement officials with whom we spoke stated that individuals who may have been assaulted or robbed in the course of drug trafficking and other illicit activities are hesitant to report their involvement to the police Making things worse, local officials are tempted by the big payoffs working with the bad guys can bring and may not be keeping a complete account of the mayhem: Cartels may target public officials and law enforcement for corruption. Specifically, we were told of cases from local law enforcement in both New Mexico and Arizona in which public officials had been corrupted by a Mexican cartel. That's the grim bottom line of a [new report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office to Congress, entitled "Southwest Border Security,"](http://www.sandiegoreader.com/documents/2013/mar/01/gao-drugwar-report/) that presents several scary scenarios regarding future incursions. While [Department of Homeland Security] and [Department of Justice] threat assessments indicate that violent infighting between drug cartels has remained largely in Mexico, DHS assessments also show that aggressive tactics used by traffickers to evade capture demonstrate an increasing threat to U.S. law enforcement. Officials noted that there is always potential for the high levels of violence in Mexico, such as organized murders and kidnappings for ransom, to spread to their border towns. Despite the perceived threat, the report goes on to say that valid numbers on stateside drug war crime are virtually impossible to come up with: Law enforcement agencies have few efforts to track spillover crime. No common federal government definition of such crime exists, and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Department of Justice (DOJ) components, including those with a definition, either do not collect data to track spillover crime, or do not maintain such data that can be readily retrieved and analyzed. Officials from the San Diego office of the California Highway Patrol stated that in 2012 their field office began tracking how often they respond to calls from CBP’s Office of Field Operations to investigate incidents at the port of entry. However, the officials noted that the data could not be a measure for spillover crime because the incident may not always result in a crime or an arrest and may not be related to cartel activity or involve Mexican nationals. The GAO researchers even had a problem coming up with a reasonable definition of what they were studying: Stakeholders view the term “spillover” differently. Depending on the stakeholder, the term “spillover” might refer only to Mexican drug cartel-related violence or be defined as a broader concept of spillover crime, which includes both violent and nonviolent activities. Examples of such activities include rape or murder committed in connection with cross- border or drug cartel activity; keeping smuggled aliens in stash houses and ransoming them back to Mexico; smuggling of firearms, drugs, and people; vandalism such as littering on smuggling routes; and destroying private property, such as cutting fences and killing cattle. Officials from 27 out of 37 state and local law enforcement agencies stated that it would be at least somewhat useful to have a common definition of spillover crime, because it would establish types of activities that constitute spillover crime and allow agencies to track such crime, among other uses. However, officials from 22 of those 27 agencies also stated that accomplishing such a task might be challenging.

## Food Prices

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Food prices cause increase in food prices- water availability

**Calzadilla, Rehdanz and Tol 2013**

(Alvaro, Katrin and Richard, Kiel Institute for the World Economy and Department of Economics, Department of Economics ,Christian Albrechts University of Kiel and Economic and Social Research Institute, “Trade Liberalization and Climate Change: A Computable General Equilibrium Analysis of the Impacts on Global Agriculture,” 6-1-11, EBSCOhost, 7-10-13, http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2063/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=fd44c287-e9ee-47f0-8b18-eb90cf8e1719%40sessionmgr115&vid=24&hid=107)//KC

Many studies focus on natural science aspects of water availability, but analyses on the economic responses are important as well. Economies and in particular agricultural sectors of some developing countries might be hit particularly hard by a changing climate and a change in water availability putting at risk regional food security and the livelihood conditions for the rural poor. The agricultural sector is by far the largest consumer of water and farmers operate, directly or indirectly, at the world market for agricultural products. As future climate change is expected to modify the regional distribution of freshwater water resources, it could generate new opportunity costs and reverse regional comparative advantages in food production. As a result, regional trade patterns and welfare are expected to change. Regions with reliable water resources may experience positive impacts in food production and exports. At the same time, food exporting regions may be vulnerable not only to direct climate induced agricultural damages, but also to positive impacts elsewhere. Climate variability, especially changes in rainfall patterns, is particularly important for rainfed agr iculture. Soil moisture limitations reduce crop productivity and increase the risk of rainfed farming systems. Although the risk of climate variability is reduced by the use of irrigation, irrigated farming Water 2011 , 3 528 systems are dependent on reliable water resources ; therefore , they may be exposed to changes in the spatial and temporal distribution of river flow. One of the few analyses of the impacts of climate change induced changes in water resources on agriculture in the context of international trade is Calzadil la et al. [5]. In addition to information on predicted changes in river flows under the IPCC SRES A1B and A2 scenarios from Falloon and Betts [4], they analy z e the effects of temperature, precipitation and CO 2 fertilization on crop yields. The SRES A1B scenario has relatively little warming while the SRES A2 scenario shows higher levels of greenhouse gas concentration in the atmosphere. The results show that global food production, welfare and GDP fall due to climate change while food prices increase. Larg er changes are observed under the SRES A2 scenario for the medium term (2020) and under the SRES A1B scenario for the long term (2050). The results are more pronounced , if irrigation areas respond to water availability as well.

### FT bad = increase in Food prices

#### Free trade increases food prices

**The World Bank 12** (“What are the facts about rising food prices and their effect on the region?,” The World Bank, 9/13/2012,

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/09/13/america_latina_crisis_precio_alimentos>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

Logistic problems drive up food prices In many Latin American and Caribbean countries, logistic and transport costs have more of an impact than customs duties on the price of commercial trade.  The World Bank estimates that logistic expenses account for between 16% and 26% of GDP, and between 18% and 32% of the value of the commodities, compared with about 9% of GDP and commodity value in the countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). In the case of Central American processed goods, the internal logistic burden increases the cost of food commodities with higher unit values by 8% to 15%. Beginning in 2000, bilateral and regional free trade agreements reduced customs duties worldwide. Nevertheless, freight costs have more than doubled. For large-volume commodities of relatively low value, such as grains and edible oils, shipping and freight costs can increase the final price to the consumer by 30% to 50%. Food commodities entering a Caribbean or Central American country often are subject to multiple delays, unnecessary direct costs and damages that ultimately hurt consumers. According to the World Bank’s Logistic Performance Index, customs clearance is particularly deficient in the Caribbean, where it normally takes from three to five days (compared with less than a day in Chile and three days in Latin America as a whole). Moreover, in several countries of the two sub-regions, imports take much longer to reach the broker after unloading, particularly in Costa Rica, Haiti, Jamaica and Panama.

## Hegemony Good

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade hurts hegemony

**Heffner 13** (Thomas, “We are Completely Unprotected in an Economic War that is Destroying Our Economy and Country,” *Economy in Crisis*, 7/7/2013, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/we-are-completely-unprotected-in-an-economic-war-that-is-destroying-our-economy-and-country>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

The consequences of losing an economic war are as damaging as if we lost a military war. American companies are increasingly closing up, selling out or going bankrupt and we are forced to outsource our manufacturing to foreign companies. At home, the few jobs that remain have us working for lower wages for our new conquering foreign masters. States beg and compete against each other to get foreign companies to set up shop in their state. We give foreign companies more and more benefits to give us a few menial jobs. We have been rendered uncompetitive, defenseless and will be forced to accept a future declining standard of living if we do not act now. To survive we must end all “free trade” pacts immediately or surrender in an economic war that has been forced on us and is destroying us.

#### Loss of American power projection capacity causes global war.

Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth ’13 (Stephen, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College “Don’t Come Home America: The Case Against Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Winter 2012/13), pp. 7–51)

A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war. 72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions. 73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays. 74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States. 75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives. 76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case. 77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces. 78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem. 79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferation changes as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows. 80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.” 81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.” 82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing. 83 In sum, the argument that U.S. security commitments are unnecessary for peace is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difªcult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States. 84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking. 85

### FT hurts US hegemony - Exts

#### Free trade destroys U.S. competitiveness

**AVA 12** (“The Damaging Consequences Of Free Trade,” *AVA Investment Analytics*, 12/29/2012,

<http://www.avaresearch.com/avanew/articles/1169/The-Damaging-Consequences-Of-Free-Trade.html>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

4. Selling off America’s Technology Advantage Free trade has also put America’s research and innovation on the auction block. For instance, technology transfer departments can be found on nearly every university campus. Their objective is to sell or license patents and other types of intellectual property that have been developed by university researchers to the highest bidder from the private sector. There are virtually no restrictions on who can purchase university patents and other forms of intellectual property that have been developed at America’s finest universities. For instance, one of the largest customers of university-based  intellectual property outside of the U.S. has been Japan. Auctioning off university-based intellectual property to foreign competitors jeopardizes America’s innovation leadership, which is really the last remaining pillar of the U.S. economy. Moreover, it represents taxpayer fraud because much of the research leading to the formation of these intangible assets has been funded by U.S. taxpayers. This represents just one of many examples of greed that has infiltrated and perverted the nation’s so-called non-profit university system. 5. Declining Scientific Research The free trade-inspired shift in the U.S. from a manufacturing to service economy has created many other negative side effects. Over the past two decades, as America’s manufacturing base has been sent overseas, federal research funding has dissipated. As fascism strengthened its grip on the U.S., the gap in R&D funding began to be filled by large corporations. Rather than an atmosphere of unhindered basic research and development, a significant portion of the nation’s innovative mandates are now funded by large corporations, both domestic and foreign. As a result of this change, much of the research in American universities is focused on near-term commercial ventures rather than pure scientific investigation. This short-sighted approach has already damaged America’s leadership in basic scientific research. Perhaps the biggest problem underlying this trend is that it can take decades before the consequences are felt.

#### Free Trade not helping the economy and kills national interest - just a masking

**Lindsey**, senior fellow at the CATO institute and director of its Center for Trade Policy Studies, **2012**

(Brink, “Free Trade Nationalism”, CATO institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/free-trade-nationalism>, accessed on 7/8/13, BT)

Protectionist countries have changed their policies in order to catch up economically with more open countries. It follows that the most important thing the United States can do to foster liberalization elsewhere is to set a good example. It’s not just that free traders have sold their cause on foreign policy grounds. Through linking trade liberalization exclusively with international negotiations, they have actually conveyed the impression that free trade requires the subordination of the U.S. national economic interest to broader concerns. After all, in trade talks countries agree to reduce their trade barriers only on the condition that other countries do likewise. Thus, trade barriers are treated like nuclear missiles in arms control talks — prized strategic assets that are given up only in exchange for foreign assets of equivalent value. (Indeed, in the parlance of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a commitment to reduce tariffs is a “concession.”) With the issue so framed, the military metaphors proliferate. Trade “hawks” argue that relatively open markets amount to “unilateral disarmament,” and urge that we close off access to U.S. markets unless foreign countries let in more American goods. Free traders, by resisting such calls, get cast as “doves.” Of course, the equation of trade with war is economic nonsense. Trade, unlike war, is not a zero sum game: one country doesn’t “win” at another’s expense. In particular, openness to foreign competition is not a vulnerability. On the contrary, it allows a country’s citizens to enjoy the best goods and services the world has to offer, and to specialize in those pursuits at which they are relatively more productive. And the benefits of open markets accrue regardless of whether other countries maintain similarly liberal policies. Nevertheless, free traders have seldom challenged the protectionist misconceptions that trade talks encourage. By and large they accept the notion that the United States is somehow at a disadvantage because most of our trading partners maintain higher trade barriers than we do. Their position is that America is strong enough to “win” at international trade even with the deck stacked against us; and anyway, they argue, broader geopolitical interests — countering Soviet power, and now maintaining some kind of nebulous “influence” — outweigh narrow commercial concerns. Thus, by the twisted logic of trade negotiations, free traders appear to be asking the United States to play by less favorable rules than apply to other countries. Furthermore, the direction of trade negotiations in recent years suggests a connection between free trade and the progressive diminution of U.S. national sovereignty. The scope of trade agreements has broadened far beyond simple tariff-cutting to encompass sweeping forays into traditional domestic policy areas. In particular, efforts to “harmonize” national policies on labor and the environment are working their way onto negotiating agendas at both the regional and multilateral levels. And to enforce these increasingly ambitious agreements, new and more powerful international institutions — most notably, the World Trade Organization — have been created and empowered to pronounce judgment on national laws’ fidelity to international obligations.

## Culture

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free Trade causes flooding of food destroying systems of culture- Africa proves

**Science News, 2010**

(“Free Trade, Loss of Support Systems Crippling Food Production in Africa”, Science News, February 16, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/02/100215174136.htm>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Despite good intentions, the push to privatize government functions and insistence upon "free trade" that is too often unfair has caused declining food production, increased poverty and a hunger crisis for millions of people in many African nations, researchers conclude in a new study.Market reforms that began in the mid-1980s and were supposed to aid economic growth have actually backfired in some of the poorest nations in the world, and just in recent years led to multiple food riots, scientists report Feb 15 in *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. "Many of these reforms were designed to make countries more efficient, and seen as a solution to failing schools, hospitals and other infrastructure," said Laurence Becker, an associate professor of geosciences at Oregon State University. "But they sometimes eliminated critical support systems for poor farmers who had no car, no land security, made $1 a day and had their life savings of $600 hidden under a mattress."These people were then asked to compete with some of the most efficient agricultural systems in the world, and they simply couldn't do it," Becker said. "With tariff barriers removed, less expensive imported food flooded into countries, some of which at one point were nearly self-sufficient in agriculture. Many people quit farming and abandoned systems that had worked in their cultures for centuries."These forces have undercut food production for 25 years, the researchers concluded. They came to a head in early 2008 when the price of rice -- a staple in several African nations -- doubled in one year for consumers who spent much of their income solely on food. Food riots, political and economic disruption ensued. The study was done by researchers from OSU, the University of California at Los Angeles and Macalester College. It was based on household and market surveys and national production data.There are no simple or obvious solutions, Becker said, but developed nations and organizations such as the World Bank or International Monetary Fund need to better recognize that approaches which can be effective in more advanced economies don't readily translate to less developed nations."We don't suggest that all local producers, such as small farmers, live in some false economy that's cut off from the rest of the world," Becker said."But at the same time, we have to understand these are often people with little formal education, no extension systems or bank accounts, often no cars or roads," he said. "They can farm land and provide both food and jobs in their countries, but sometimes they need a little help, in forms that will work for them. Some good seeds, good advice, a little fertilizer, a local market for their products." Many people in African nations, Becker said, farm local land communally, as they have been doing for generations, without title to it or expensive equipment -- and have developed systems that may not be advanced, but are functional. They are often not prepared to compete with multinational corporations or sophisticated trade systems. The loss of local agricultural production puts them at the mercy of sudden spikes in food costs around the world. And some of the farmers they compete with in the U.S., East Asia and other nations receive crop supports or subsidies of various types, while they are told they must embrace completely free trade with no assistance. "A truly free market does not exist in this world," Becker said. "We don't have one, but we tell hungry people in Africa that they are supposed to."This research examined problems in Gambia and Cote d'Ivoire in Western Africa, where problems of this nature have been severe in recent years. It also looked at conditions in Mali, which by contrast has been better able to sustain local food production -- because of better roads, a location that makes imported rice more expensive, a cultural commitment to local products and other factors.Historically corrupt governments continue to be a problem, the researchers said."In many African nations people think of the government as looters, not as helpers or protectors of rights," Becker said. "But despite that, we have to achieve a better balance in governments providing some minimal supports to help local agriculture survive."An emphasis that began in the 1980s on wider responsibilities for the private sector, the report said, worked to an extent so long as prices for food imports, especially rice, remained cheap. But it steadily caused higher unemployment and an erosion in local food production, which in 2007-08 exploded in a global food crisis, street riots and violence. The sophisticated techniques and cash-crop emphasis of the "Green Revolution" may have caused more harm than help in many locations, the study concluded.Another issue, they said, was an "urban bias" in government assistance programs, where the few support systems in place were far more oriented to the needs of city dwellers than their rural counterparts.Potential solutions, the researchers concluded, include more diversity of local crops, appropriate tariff barriers to give local producers a reasonable chance, subsidies where appropriate, and the credit systems, road networks, and local mills necessary to process local crops and get them to local markets.

**Cultural survival is key to human survival**

Maivan **Clech Lam**, Visiting Associate Professor at American University Washington College of Law, **2000**, At The Edge of the State: Indigenous Peoples and Self-Determination, p. 205-206

Nevertheless, as anthropologists know, ethnicity is both an enabling and an inescapable condition of human existence. It is a collective system of meaning that generates social energy which can be put to constructive and destructive uses equally. Stavenhagen writes: Cultures are complex patterns of social relationships, mate­rial objects, and spiritual values that give meaning and iden­tity to community life and are a resource for solving the problems of everyday life. That some very ugly campaigns in modern history, usually unleashed by the destructive economic and military policies of the world’s powerful states, have tapped, frighteningly successfully, into ethnic energy is undeniable. But it is just as undeniable that knowledge—of the universe, of a specific part of it, of workable social rela­tionships, of human nature—that is crucial to the project of human survival remains separately encoded in the distinctive cultures of eth­nic groups. No human community or ethnic group can construct an informed and meaningful future if it is cut off from its cultural past. And alienation from meaning, as much as exploited meaning, can lead to violence.

### FT crushes Culture- Exts

#### Free trade causes culture to be homogeneous

**Burri 2013**

(Mira, a senior research fellow at the Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research, “Reconciling Trade and Culture: A Global Law Perspective,” 4-1-11, EBSCOhost, 7-10-13, http://ehis.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=d4a0842a-cb6e-4816-a397-71b3ef7b6808%40sessionmgr104&vid=6&hid=105)//KC

While the Convention elevates “the status of cultural diversity as a matter of international concern, just as international agreements on the environment and health have helped to underline the importance of these considerations in other international fora such as the WTO,” 23 we see this only partially as an advancement toward a better functioning global governance system. Indeed, and here lies our core argument, one can view the UNESCO Convention as part of the problem rather than the solution. As mentioned at the outset, it is a sign of a growing disconnection between issues of trade and culture—a disconnection that does none of these domains any good and does not reflect the developments in contemporary media markets. Flawed Understanding of the Effects of Trade Upon Culture The debate on trade and culture has been defined by a deeply convoluted (if not to say flawed) understanding of the effects of trade and more broadly economic globalization upon culture. While it is indubitable that “trade generates complex and often contradictory effects,” 24 it is equally certain that trade is not a “zero-sum” game, 25 and there are a number of ways in which trade enhances cultural flows and exchanges. In the “trade and culture” discourse, however, the common (and particularly loud) statements are that cultural diversity is becoming impoverished and almost extinguished as the globalized flow of easy entertainment coming from Hollywood dominates and homogenizes. 26 This (mis)conception 27 is difficult to put right or to soften at least. The discussion on “trade values” and “non-trade values” is extremely politicized and often resembles a clash between two religions that find no channel of communication between them. In the specific sense of cultural policy making, the debate is additionally burdened with notions of cultural and national identity that lead to national sovereignty susceptibilities. In the subcontext of policy making in audiovisual media, the discussion is further complicated since “one’s view on the role of media in society is intimately bound up with one’s view of democracy and the proper bounds of governmental power.” 28 Ultimately, all these interrelated discourses are in a profound state of transition: endogenously (within the nation-state), “as the audiovisual RECONCILING TRADE AND CULTURE 143 sector moves from being a separable and quarantined domain of governance to its enactment as part of a whole-of-government modelling in which it emerges as a service industry in a ‘digital economy,”’ 29 and exogenously (outside the nation state), as liberalization, migration, and other forces of globalization 30 induce sweeping societal shifts that make modern society increasingly homogeneous across cultures and heterogeneous within them. Under these circumstances, it is becoming outdated and increasingly inappropriate to apply notions of cultural diversity, which “tend to favour ‘billiard ball’ representations of cultures as neatly bounded wholes whose contents are given and static. These understandings downplay ‘the ways in which meanings and symbols of culture are produced through complex processes of translations, negotiation and enunciation,’ as well as by contestation and conflict.” 31 To be sure, these are precisely the perceptions of the UNESCO Convention, whose premise is that it is cultural diversity between nations and not within nations that needs to be protected and promoted, and this stance shapes the cultural policy measures taken by the State Parties. On a more pragmatic level, it needs to be mentioned that in the context of trade and culture, “‘the fight [ ... ] is seldom over “high” culture,’ which the US, like many other nations, routinely subsidizes. What is really at stake is control over the flow of, and capacity to profit from, popular culture.” 32 What has been a thorn in the side of all “ exception culturelle ” proponents is the fact that the U.S. content industries have been “America’s most successful exporters.” 33

#### Trade excludes culture talks

**Vogel 13** (Toby, “MEPs vote to exclude culture from trade talks with US,” European Voice, 5/23/2013,

<http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/2013/may/meps-vote-to-exclude-culture-from-trade-talks-with-us/77339.aspx>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

The European Parliament has demanded that cultural and audiovisual services be excluded from negotiations on a free-trade agreement between the European Union and the United States that are expected to start before the summer. MEPs approved the call for an exemption with 381 in favour and 191 against, with 17 abstentions, in Strasbourg today (23 May). The exemption has split the Parliament's largest group, of the centre-right European People's Party. Marielle Gallo, a French MEP from the EPP, said: “The cultural exception is a European, a French specificity that cannot be put into doubt by a free-trade agreement. It is non-negotiable.” Gallo said that the imbalance between cultural exports suggested that Europe would gain nothing from liberalisation. She said that the US exported audiovisual services worth $7.5 billion to Europe in 2010 while just $1.8bn worth of services were traded in the other direction. But Daniel Caspary, a German centre-right MEP who is the EPP's trade spokesman, said: “We want to negotiate with the United States on a par, and in an atmosphere of mutual trust. Real friends such as Europe and the US are able to talk about difficult topics. This is just the beginning, where we must be able to speak openly about all topics for which the EU is responsible.” The call for a cultural exemption found support across the aisle. Hannes Swoboda, the leader of the group of the centre-left Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament, said: “This is of major importance to us. We fully support a forward-looking trade and investment agreement with the US, but when negotiating, the Commission must know that the European Parliament has a strong opinion on preserving cultural diversity. This relates both to existing but also to future media platforms.” Yannick Jadot, a French Green, fired a broadside at trade talks: “The Commission is sadly simply guided by a dogmatic belief in trade liberalisation, with little regard for EU standards. Commissioner De Gucht himself has stated that everything is on the table. The result poses a real threat to core EU standards and rules, whether as regards the protection of the cultural sector and public services, intellectual property and data protection, food safety, GMOs, geographical indications, health and environmental standards... the risks are many. The US is much better organised in terms of economic and industrial policy and will have no qualms about defending its narrow interests.”

## Warming Bad

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free Trade increases total emissions through used vehicles – Mexico proves

Davis & Kahn**,** 2010, Research Associate (Davis) & leading American educator in the field of environmental economics (Kahn), Lucas & Matthew, “International Trade in

Used Vehicles: The Environmental Consequences of NAFTA”, American Economic Association, November 2010, JSTOR, 7/5/13, JG

Wealthy nations demand a range of high-quality transportation equipment (cars, trucks, trains, buses, boats, and planes), as well as residential durable goods (air conditioners, clothes washers), commercial durables (computers, lighting, heating and cooling equipment) and industrial durables (power generating equipment, metal working equipment, construction machinery). These durable goods depreciate in quality over time. Poorer nations want to purchase similar durable goods, but due to operating cost differences and income effects, desire lower quality. From a societal perspective, there are gains to trade from shipping used durable goods from rich countries to poorer countries. In this paper, we argued that this pattern has important implications for the environment. As we discuss in the paper, the effect of trade on emissions depends on the relative magnitude of scale and composition effects. Trade provides rich countries with an outlet for older durable goods. Because older durables are typically high emitting, this tends to decrease average and total emissions in rich countries. In poor countries, trade increases the number of durable goods, but may also improve the quality of the stock. Whether or not this change in composition is large enough to offset the scale effect, depends on the characteristics of the initial stock of durable goods and other factors. Whereas several theoretical contributions have recognized the role of consumption-based pollution, the deregulation of the market for used cars and trucks following NAFTA provides a valuable opportunity to empirically assess the magnitude of these different effects. We find that scale effects are immediate and large in magnitude, with millions of vehicles exported from the United States to Mexico during the first years of trade. Composition effects are also large. For local pollutants, we find that traded vehicles have significantly higher emissions per mile than the stock in the United States, and significantly lower emissions per mile than the stock in Mexico. Overall, however, the evidence suggests that trade has increased total life time emissions, primarily because of low vehicle retirement rates in Mexico.

#### Positive feedbacks ensure runaway warming, causes extinction

Speth 2008[James, dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. Currently he serves the school as the Carl W. Knobloch, Jr. Dean and Sara Shallenberger Brown Professor in the Practice of Environmental Policy, The Bridge @ the Edge of the World, pg. 26]

The possibility of abrupt climate change is linked to what may be the most problematic possibility of all—"positive" feedback effects where the initial warming has effects that generate more warming. Several of these feedbacks are possible. First, the land's ability to store carbon could weaken. Soils and forests can dry out or burn and release carbon; less plant growth can occur, thus reducing nature's ability to remove carbon from the air. Second, carbon sinks in the oceans could also be reduced due to ocean warming and other factors. Third, the potent greenhouse gas methane could be released from peat bogs, wetlands, and thawing permafrost, and even from the methane hydrates in the oceans, as the planet warms and changes. Finally, the earth's albedo, the reflectivity of the earth's surface, is slated to be reduced as large areas now covered by ice and snow diminish or are covered by meltwater. All these effects would tend to make warming self-reinforcing, possibly leading to a greatly amplified greenhouse effect. The real possibility of these amplifying feedbacks has alarmed some of our top scientists. James Hansen, the courageous NASA climate scientist, is becoming increasingly outspoken as his investigations lead him to more and more disturbing conclusions. He offered the following assessment in 2007: "Our home planet is now dangerously near a 'tipping point.' Human-made greenhouse gases are near a level such that important climate changes may proceed mostly under the climate system's own momentum. Impacts would include extermination of a large fraction of species on the planet, shifting of climatic zones due to an intensified hydrologic cycle with effects on freshwater availability and human health, and repeated worldwide coastal tragedies associated with storms and a continuously rising sea level. .. . "Civilization developed during the Holocene, a period of relatively tranquil climate now almost 12,000 years in duration. The planet has been warm enough to keep ice sheets off North America and Europe, but cool enough for ice sheets on Greenland and Antarctica to be stable. Now, with rapid warming of o.6°C in the past 30 years, global temperature is at its warmest level in the Holocene. "This warming has brought us to the precipice of a great 'tipping point” If we go over the edge, it will be a transition to 'a different planet,' an environment far outside the range that has been experienced by humanity. There will be no return within the lifetime of any generation that can be imagined, and the trip will exterminate a large fraction of species on the planet.

### Free Trade Increases Emissions – Exts

#### Free trade destroys the environment – wastes produced

**AVA 12** (“The Damaging Consequences Of Free Trade,” *AVA Investment Analytics*, 12/29/2012,

<http://www.avaresearch.com/avanew/articles/1169/The-Damaging-Consequences-Of-Free-Trade.html>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

6. Human Exploitation and Environmental Catastrophe  Although free trade has heightened the economic growth of developing nations, it has also been responsible for numerous adverse consequences seldom discussed in the media. For instance, lax environmental regulations have transformed certain parts of China into cesspools of toxic waste, poisoning the land, water and local residents. Already, several villages in China that have been littered with industrial waste are experiencing astronomically high rates of cancer afflicting large numbers of relatively young adults. Those developing nations that have permitted slave labor and have neglected reasonable standards of environmental protection are creating enormous contingent liabilities. Over the next few decades, massive sums of money will be required to address chronic damage to the ecosystem and to fund healthcare systems in Southeast Asia which will be overwhelmed with millions of victims of free trade.

## Honeybees

### 1NC/1AC Module

#### Free trade spreads pathogens that kill honeybees

[ANDREW LEONARD](http://www.salon.com/writer/andrew_leonard/) [is a staff writer at Salon] SEP 6, 2007¶ [Could free trade be killing the honeybees?](http://www.salon.com/2007/09/06/australian_honeybees/)¶ <http://www.salon.com/2007/09/06/australian_honeybees/>

California almonds, imported Australian honeybees, an evil pathogen known to the world only as Israel acute paralysis virus, and the ever-popular [varroa mite.](http://www.ca.uky.edu/entomology/entfacts/ef608.asp) What does it all add up to? Chapter 47 in “The Hunt for the Colony Collapse Disorder Murderer.”¶ No question about it, the scientific investigation into [the mysterious deaths of millions of bees](http://www.salon.com/tech/htww/2007/05/02/gm_honeybee2/index.html) in the U.S. and elsewhere earlier this year is [the story that keeps on buzzing.](http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2007/05/29/missing_bees/) Now comes [a report in Science magazine](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/summary/317/5843/1304) announcing that a special CCD task force has fingered its first promising suspect.¶ Erik Stokstad reports:¶ The identification of a suspect is an important step, says Nicholas Calderone of Cornell University. “Before, we didn’t even have circumstantial evidence.”¶ The suspect is a pathogen called Israel acute paralysis virus (IAPV). A team of researchers reports online in Science this week that they found the virus in most of the affected colonies they tested, but in almost no healthy ones. If the virus proves to be the cause of CCD, it could have international economic implications, for the researchers point to Australia as a possible source. Since 2005, U.S. beekeepers, especially those struggling to keep up with the insatiable demand for almond pollination in California, have imported several million dollars’ worth of bees from Australia. The researchers report that they have found IAPV in imported Australian bees.¶ However, there is by no means a consensus among the bee detectives. For one thing, Australia isn’t experiencing outbreaks of CCD. One theory explaining this focuses on the possible role of varroa mite, a nasty little bug that is a great spreader of bee pathogens in the U.S., but is absent in Australia. Then again, Canada has varroa mites and imported Australian bees, but no CCD.¶ But never mind the quibblers. I always knew that California’s insatiable demand for almond pollination would prove to be its downfall.¶ Well, actually, no. That’s not true. I knew nothing of the sort. However, in [my first venture into this hive of perplexity,](http://ww1.salon.com/tech/htww/2007/02/27/honeybees_and_china/index.html) back in February, I did suggest that “globalization” (in the form of cheap imported Chinese honey) was a likely culprit. Now we see that Australian imports may be the real villain. I may have gotten the plague vector wrong, but not the disease! Could one ask for a clearer case of international labor migration gone horribly awry?

**Causes extinction.**

Stein, The Amazing Honey Bee, 1999 <http://www.abfnet.org/essay/1999/second.html>

Honey bees are important to people. Honey bees are the only insects in the world to produce food which is eaten by people. Bees pollinate crops for farmers and fruit growers. Most flowers depend on bees. The wax of the honey comb is used in manufacturing polishes, floor wax, candles, crayons, and cosmetics. Wax is used in gum and inks. It's also in electrical insulation. Honey is found in medicines, crackers, cookies, other baked good, and as a sweet spread. The honey bee's wax was necessary to bring the first artifical light of candles to man's shelter. Wax was the first molding and sealing agent. It was used for the king's royal seal, as well as houswives reserving of jams. Pollination by bees is needed by plants, and plants are necessary to human survival.

### FT hurts honeybees- Exts

#### Free trade allows pathogens to spread the destroy bee populations- Big Honey is a mega business key to economies

Sven Carlsson [journalist for Opotiki News]¶ Decline in bee population a threat to economy¶ June 27, 2013¶ <http://www.opotikinews.co.nz/webapps/i/88879/228222/489920>

POLITICAL agendas are among the factors that are putting New Zealand bees at risk – and with it, several multi-billion dollar industries. In our previous story about the plight of bees, Bee Friendly Farming Group chairman Ross Little said disease, pesticides, and the loss of “good pollen habitat” was increasingly putting the pressure on bees, and that healthy bees could “no longer be taken for granted”. This could have catastrophic consequences for New Zealand farming as bees are important for pollinating crops. Tauranga beekeeper Neil Mossop, of Mossop’s Honey, said he strongly endorsed Mr Little’s warnings about the threats to the New Zealand economy. Mr Mossop’s family has been in the beekeeping industry for 65 years and his company, which conducts 25,000 hive movements per year, also operates in the Eastern Bay. “They are hoping to build the kiwifruit industry into a $3 billion export business – and bees are instrumental for that industry,” Mr Mossop said. “Today, beehives all have to be managed otherwise they won’t survive.” Mr Mossop said the estimate used to be there was one feral bee colony for each managed hive in New Zealand, of which there are 420,000, but since the onslaught of varroa mites, virtually all feral colonies have died. “Feral colonies are not treated for varroa – and they are dying out,” he said. “There has been a dramatic reduction of bees available for pollination as a result.” In addition, political agendas posed another threat by aiming to allow “free trade” in honey, meaning more diseases could be introduced to New Zealand via import. “In New Zealand, we produce 16,000 tonnes of honey per year, most of which is exported,” Mr Mossop said. “Is does not make sense for us to import it.” Mr Mossop said professional beekeepers were particularly worried about a bacterial disease called European foulbrood.

## A2 Free Trade Good Scenarios

### Generic Answers

#### Free Trade causes exact opposite of positive theory- multiple reasons

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

Indeed, free trade applied to the Arab world will make “small, low-income” local population vulnerable to outside competition (Moore and Schrank, 2003: 116). The region is currently protected by high local protection in the form of tariffs and non-tariffs barriers. Therefore, opening Arab countries to international trade will result in a diminution of wages and the worsening of work conditions in order to meet the profitability requirements of international competition. As they currently stand, trade agreements will seldom encourage local governments to train and invest in their workers (Moore and Schrank, 2003: 118). By increasing the gap between the haves and the have-nots, this equation holds the risks of increasing the antagonism against the USA, therefore undermining the fight against terrorism. A good illustration is the case of Tunisia. Tunisia has been described as a model for economic development and has been lauded for following the recommendations of the World Bank and the IMF. In reality, the notable success of the export sector in Tunisia benefited only a few and masked the deteriorating living conditions of the rural poor. Neo-liberal reforms –which were encouraged along with free trade- have distributed nearly 1 million hectares of state-owned lands to large landowners, at the expense of smaller peasants. They have also granted preferential access to credit and equipment to landowners while there was no net job creation in agriculture. In order to deflect the social discontent and instability, state officials relied on the moral economy to meet these peasant’s most basic and dire needs, thus reinforcing associations based on blood, religion and patrimonial ties (King, 2000: 201 & 205).The second assumption is that economic prosperity increases the chance of political reforms: freedom of trade, by encouraging countries to conform to international norms of trade, will result in due time in political reform and democratization (Nasr, 2009: 9). In reality, this narrative turned out to be deceptive for the Arab world, as trade agreements have achieved the exact opposite: they have reinforced political status quo and encouraged crony capitalism. The USA wrongly assumed that preferential trade agreements (PTA’s) and free trade zones would overhaul social and political institutions in accordance with American interests’ in the region. Yet, local actors such “investors, entrepreneurs and firms capitalize upon foreign trade by exploiting, rather than transforming, their pre-existing social and political institutions” (Moore and Schrank, 2003: 112). In the case of Jordan for instance, the profits generated by the QIZ and FTAs did nothing but reinforce the regime’s hold on power, thus increasing the risk of an Islamist and anti-American backlash (Lobell, 2009: 90). The same problem was encountered in every Arab country that embraced economic liberalization. In Syria, Tunisia or Egypt, businessmen close to authoritarian regimes were granted preferential access to business and trade opportunities under the condition of collaboration with the state. Businessmen such as Rami Makhlouf or Ahmad Ezz did everything but push for economic and political reforms. They used their privileged access to business ventures to monopolize profits, preventing any of it to trickle down to the population that came to abhor these symbols of corruption. Put differently, “freer trade has not led to greater economic and political decentralization (…) but has served to institutionalize status-quo political interests” (Moore and Schrank, 2003: 117).Lastly, while there might be a strong correlation between economic growth and social stability, there is no proven relationship between economic growth and the eradication of terrorism. This way of reasoning dismisses the ideological motivations behind any terrorist movement. Economic grievances might give marginalized individuals more incentives to join a terrorist organization, but reducing their motivations to an issue of poverty is highly simplistic. One shouldn’t dismiss other religious and political motivations such as the desire to establish an Islamic state or the will to wage war against Israel and Western countries supporting Arab dictators, among many others. As observed by White, the “leaders of Salafia Jihadia and the Moroccan Islamic Combatant Group (GICM), implicated in the Casablanca and Madrid bombings respectively (…) are not poor. They, and many of their followers, are motivated not so much by a narrow economic calculus but by their rejection of Western notions of modernity and a desire to create an Islamic state” (White, 2005: 62-63). Another classical example that is often cited is Osama Bin Laden: coming from a wealthy background didn’t really discourage him to create his own terrorist organization. As such, one needs to put that argument into perspective: economic prosperity and social stability are certainly important conditions to fight terrorism but they are far from being sufficient in and of themselves.

### A2 Conflict Turn

#### No great power wars – diplomacy and nuclear weapons

David Bosco (Senior Editor at Foreign Policy Magazine) July 23 2006 'Could This Be the Start of World War III?,' http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/sunday/commentary/la-op-bosco23jul23,0,6188365.story?coll=la-sunday-commentary

There is another factor working in favor of great-power caution: nuclear weapons. Europe's leaders on the eve of World War I can perhaps be forgiven for not understanding the carnage they were about to unleash. That generation grew up in a world of short wars that did limited damage. Leaders today should have no such illusions. The installation of emergency hot lines between national capitals was a recognition of the need for fast and clear communication in times of crisis. Diplomatic tools have advanced too. Sluggish though it may be, the U.N. Security Council regularly gathers the great powers' representatives in a room to hash out developing crises.

### A2 Agriculture Turn

#### New tech and adaption solve food shortages

Michaels 11 Patrick Michaels is senior fellow in environmental studies at the CATO Institute. " Global Warming and Global Food Security," June 30, CATO, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/global-warming-global-food-security

While doing my dissertation I learned a few things about world crops. Serial adoption of new technologies produces a nearly constant increase in yields. Greater fertilizer application, improved response to fertilizer, better tractor technology, better tillage practices, old-fashioned genetic selection, and new-fashioned genetic engineering all conspire to raise yields, year after year.¶ Weather and climate have something to do with yields, too. Seasonal rainfall can vary a lot from year-to-year. That's "weather." If dry years become dry decades (that's "climate") farmers will switch from corn to grain sorghum, or, where possible, wheat. Breeders and scientists will continue to develop more water-efficient plants and agricultural technologies, such as no-till production.¶ Adaptation even applies to the home garden. The tomato variety "heat wave" sets fruit at higher temperatures than traditional cultivars.¶ However, Gillis claims that "[t]he rapid growth in farm output that defined the late 20th century has slowed" because of global warming.¶ His own figures show this is wrong. The increasing trend in world crop yields from 1960 to 1980 is exactly the same as from 1980 to 2010. And per capita grain production is rising, not falling.

### A2 Living Standards

#### New tech and adaption solve food shortages

Michaels 11 Patrick Michaels is senior fellow in environmental studies at the CATO Institute. " Global Warming and Global Food Security," June 30, CATO, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/global-warming-global-food-security

While doing my dissertation I learned a few things about world crops. Serial adoption of new technologies produces a nearly constant increase in yields. Greater fertilizer application, improved response to fertilizer, better tractor technology, better tillage practices, old-fashioned genetic selection, and new-fashioned genetic engineering all conspire to raise yields, year after year.¶ Weather and climate have something to do with yields, too. Seasonal rainfall can vary a lot from year-to-year. That's "weather." If dry years become dry decades (that's "climate") farmers will switch from corn to grain sorghum, or, where possible, wheat. Breeders and scientists will continue to develop more water-efficient plants and agricultural technologies, such as no-till production.¶ Adaptation even applies to the home garden. The tomato variety "heat wave" sets fruit at higher temperatures than traditional cultivars.¶ However, Gillis claims that "[t]he rapid growth in farm output that defined the late 20th century has slowed" because of global warming.¶ His own figures show this is wrong. The increasing trend in world crop yields from 1960 to 1980 is exactly the same as from 1980 to 2010. And per capita grain production is rising, not falling.

#### Alt Cause: Oil, Food, and Warming

APA (African Press Agency). "Increase in Food, Oil Prices Driving 100 Million People Into Poverty." 30 June 2008. http://www.netnewspublisher.com/increase-in-food-oil-prices-driving-100-million-people-into-poverty/

The current food and oil price increases tabled for discussion at the African Union summit in Egypt is driving 100 million poor people into deeper poverty, the United Nations said on Monday. The majority of these people living in poverty are said to be Africans who are highly affected by the current food and oil price increases. The oil price is approaching $150 per barrel, which is expected to make the current economic crisis in the developing countries, including Africa worse. “As we speak the food crisis-compounded by the hike in fuel prices and climate change-threatens to push an estimated 100 million people deeper into poverty and will have direct bearing on our efforts to meet the Millennium Development Goals,” said Dr. Asha-Rose Migiro, Deputy Secretary General of the UN.

### A2 Terrorism Turn

#### No Solvency-Trade solving terrorism based on false assumptions

**Adi, 2013**

(Line Zouhour, “Is Trade the Key to Fight Terrorism?”, Al Qawl, May 8, <https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/alqawl/2013/05/08/is-trade-the-key-to-fight-terrorism/>, accessed on 7/9/13, BT)

The argument that trade is the key to fight terrorism is based on too many questionable assumptions. First, it claims that free trade improves the economic and social lot of the population, thus decreasing the appeal of terrorist organization. Yet, Arab countries are not armed to face fierce international competition, unless they diminish the wages of their workers or lay off a significant number of them, thus increasing unemployment and economic instability and defeating the initial purpose of free trade. The second assumption is that free trade will push Arab countries to reform themselves to meet the requirements of international trade, thus empowering a strong private sector that will in due time push for the establishment of a transparent and democratic government. Again, this hypothesis has to be dismissed as free trade in particular and economic liberalization in general had the adverse effect of empowering a network of crony businessmen supported by most authoritarian states in the Arab world. Lastly, even if we are to assume that prosperity helps to pacify a society, there is no guarantee whatsoever that economic prosperity will undermine terrorist organizations, for their motivations exceed a simple economic calculus. Be it rejection of Western influence or the will to establish the *khilafah*, the motivations behind terrorism are aplenty. It will take more than policies of free trade or even economic growth to uproot that phenomenon.

#### Terrorist groups will not use nuclear weapons—Complications, material availability, and multiple hurdles prevent. Moreover, no risk of using in US which takes out your retaliation scenario’s

Steve Chapman 2/8/2008 “The Implausibility of Nuclear Terrorism”,

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2008/02/the\_implausibility\_of\_nuclear.html

Why are we worried? Bomb designs can be found on the Internet. Fissile material may be smuggled out of Russia. Iran, a longtime sponsor of terrorist groups, is trying to acquire nuclear weapons. A layperson may figure it's only a matter of time before the unimaginable comes to pass. Harvard's Graham Allison, in his book "Nuclear Terrorism," concludes, "On the current course, nuclear terrorism is inevitable."But remember: After Sept. 11, 2001, we all thought more attacks were a certainty. Yet al-Qaida and its ideological kin have proved unable to mount a second strike. Given their inability to do something simple -- say, shoot up a shopping mall or set off a truck bomb -- it's reasonable to ask if they have a chance at something much more ambitious. Far from being plausible, argued Ohio State University professor John Mueller in a recent presentation at the University of Chicago, "the likelihood that a terrorist group will come up with an atomic bomb seems to be vanishingly small." The events required to make that happen comprise a multitude of Herculean tasks. First, a terrorist group has to get a bomb or fissile material, perhaps from Russia's inventory of decommissioned warheads. If that were easy, one would have already gone missing. Besides, those devices are probably no longer a danger, since weapons that are not scrupulously maintained (as those have not been) quickly become what one expert calls "radioactive scrap metal." If terrorists were able to steal a Pakistani bomb, they would still have to defeat the arming codes and other safeguards designed to prevent unauthorized use. As for Iran, no nuclear state has ever given a bomb to an ally -- for reasons even the Iranians can grasp. Stealing some 100 pounds of bomb fuel would require help from rogue individuals inside some government who are prepared to jeopardize their own lives. The terrorists, notes Mueller, would then have to spirit it "hundreds of miles out of the country over unfamiliar terrain, and probably while being pursued by security forces." Then comes the task of building a bomb. It's not something you can gin up with spare parts and power tools in your garage. It requires millions of dollars, a safe haven and advanced equipment -- plus people with specialized skills, lots of time and a willingness to die for the cause. And if al-Qaida could make a prototype, another obstacle would emerge: There is no guarantee it would work, and there is no way to test it. Assuming the jihadists vault over those Himalayas, they would have to deliver the weapon onto American soil. Sure, drug smugglers bring in contraband all the time -- but seeking their help would confront the plotters with possible exposure or extortion. This, like every other step in the entire process, means expanding the circle of people who know what's going on, multiplying the chance someone will blab, back out or screw up. Mueller recalls that after the Irish Republican Army failed in an attempt to blow up British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, it said, "We only have to be lucky once. You will have to be lucky always." Al-Qaida, he says, faces a very different challenge: For it to carry out a nuclear attack, everything has to go right. For us to escape, only one thing has to go wrong. That has heartening implications. If Osama bin Laden embarks on the project, he has only a minuscule chance of seeing it bear fruit. Given the formidable odds, he probably won't bother. None of this means we should stop trying to minimize the risk by securing nuclear stockpiles, monitoring terrorist communications and improving port screening. But it offers good reason to think that in this war, it appears, the worst eventuality is one that will never happen.

### A2 Economy Turn

#### Economy shortfalls are natural part of the business cycle, it’ll bounce back

Cooley, 09- Ph.D. in Economics, Professor of Economics and Dean of New York University's Stern School of Business (Thomas, Financial booms and busts 'are inevitable'; Academic expects the next economic crisis to follow the same path as the one the world is experiencing now and it will involve a similar breakdown in confidence", South China Morning Post, November 25th 2009, December 1st 2009, Lexis Nexis, )

Another financial crisis is inevitable because booms and busts are simply part of the business cycle, a leading academic told a seminar organised by Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. Dr Thomas F. Cooley, professor of economics and dean of New York University's Stern School of Business, recently spoke at a Global Finance Seminar Series event entitled "The Next Financial Crisis" at the Hong Kong Monetary Authority (HKMA) offices. Edmond Lau, executive director of the HKMA's monetary management department and a board member of the Treasury Markets Association, delivered opening remarks, while Reginald Chua, editor-in-chief of the South China Morning Post, later moderated a panel discussion between Cooley and K.K. Tse, executive vice-president of State Street Bank and Trust Company. Cooley would not say when he thought the next financial crisis would occur but said it definitely would come because booms and busts were part of the business cycle. He said the next crisis would have the same characteristics and follow the same path as the present one - flowing from a loss of confidence. "History is replete with examples of financial crises and bank panics," he said. "Just in the United States alone, in the 20th century we had the panic of 1907, the stock market crash of 1929 and banking panics of the 1930s. Then we had a long period of relative success and calm, and then we had episodes such as the savings and loan crisis, and the failures of Continental Illinois Bank and Long Term Capital Management. "That's just in the US. In the past two decades we've had financial crises in Asia, Mexico, Chile, Sweden, Norway, Finland and Russia, so financial crises occur with some frequency, but what they don't do is occur with predictability," he said.

### A2 Trade Wars Turn

#### trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace

**MARTIN, MAYER, AND THOENIG 2008**Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

### A2 India-Pakistan Turn

#### No risk of India-Pakistan war

Bharat Karnad, Research Professor in National Security Studies at the Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, April 2005, India Review, “South Asia: The Irrelevance of Classical Nuclear Deterrence Theory,” p. 173-174

\

Deterrence theory can, perhaps, make clear how and why the Cold War between the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and their respective military blocs, did not turn hot. But it cannot adequately explain the face-off between a nuclearized India and Pakistan. Very little theorizing has been done about the workings of deterrence between two manifestly unequal states, and what little there is has grave weaknesses. Despite the marked inequalities between India and Pakistan, Western governments, with US nonproliferation- minded analysts giving the lead, insist on seeing the subcontinental reality through the dark lens of US–Soviet nuclear rivalry, pronouncing it a “nuclear flash-point.”1 By hitching the limited explanatory power of classical deterrence theory to the cause of conflict resolution in South Asia, more alarm is generated than useful insights. This unfor- tunate analogy only aggravates the situation and begets inappropriate solutions. This essay will examine the deficiencies in deterrence theory per- taining to conflictual dyads involving states differing vastly in size, resources, and power. It will give particular focus to the theoretical constructs spawned by the strategic side-shows of the Cold War fea- turing France and the United Kingdom separately prepared to fight the Soviet Union. It will discuss why such and other deterrence- derived concepts, such as the stability–instability paradox, are irrelevant to the South Asian context. Further, it will argue that the possibility of nuclear war between India and Pakistan is, realistically-speaking, infinitesimally small due to a number of factors, including: the close social and cultural linkages between the two countries and India’s fear of the consequences of prosecuting a war of annihilation against Pakistan; the conventional military near-parity and the controlled nature of the conventional India–Pakistan military conflicts that have accrued as a result; military reasons, such as a completely unbalanced “exchange ratio” that will obtain in a nuclear war, which renders all Pakistani threats to use nuclear weapons not credible; Pakistan’s deterrent posture relies on India’s sufferance for its success and that India can challenge or undermine it through a combination of targeted intelli- gence operations and conventional military initiatives, including the use of Special Forces; and, finally, the United States’ military entrenchment in Pakistan post-9/11 that all but eliminates the possibility of nuclear war between the two South Asian states.

#### The U.S. controls Pakistan’s nuclear weapons—no chance of use

Bharat Karnad, Research Professor in National Security Studies at the Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, April 2005, India Review, “South Asia: The Irrelevance of Classical Nuclear Deterrence Theory,” p. 204

Alarming theses about immanent nuclear war on the subcontinent may, in any case, be moot now that Pakistan has been turned into an American protectorate in all but name via the National Intelligence Reform Act passed by the US Congress in early December 2004, according to which the United States assumes responsibility for the security of the country, fighting terrorism within it and even nurturing democracy there.123 There is also evidence that suggests Washington, not Islamabad, is in control of critical parts of Pakistan’s nuclear deterrent and can prevent its use. In the aftermath of 9/11 and the suddenly enhanced fears of terrorists using weapons of mass destruction, Pakistani President Musharraf was faced with the Hobson’s choice of joining the United States-led war against “international terrorism” or having his country’s nuclear weapons stores and facilities destroyed.124 The eventual deal he cut provides the United States with an open-ended access to Pakistani bases and air space, and for the military pre-posi- tioning of stores and such on Pakistani territory. As a result, American forces now occupy the Jacobabad air base and exercise de facto control of the Pakistani military air space.125 Further, in order to reassure Washington and prove Pakistan’s bona fides, President Musharraf, under the rubric of making his country’s nuclear arms more safe and secure, may also have ceded to the United States, alarmed by the prospect of terrorists accessing Pakistani nuclear weapons and materials for ultimate use against American cities, the oversight of Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal, which is tantamount to a veto over the use by Pakistan of its nuclear weapons. This last, not unreasonable, conclusion may be reached on the basis of necessarily indirect evidence. Like, for example, the United States and Pakistan setting up what is called “the US Liaison Committee” comprising American experts which, according to a senior Bush Administration official, is entrusted with the job of “safeguarding” Pakistan’s arsenal of some 40 nuclear weapons, a job that has so far cost “millions” of dollars. “We don’t want their materi- als to get into the wrong hands,” this official reportedly explained.126

### A2 Property Rights Turn

#### Economy shortfalls are natural part of the business cycle, it’ll bounce back

Cooley, 09- Ph.D. in Economics, Professor of Economics and Dean of New York University's Stern School of Business (Thomas, Financial booms and busts 'are inevitable'; Academic expects the next economic crisis to follow the same path as the one the world is experiencing now and it will involve a similar breakdown in confidence", South China Morning Post, November 25th 2009, December 1st 2009, Lexis Nexis, )

Another financial crisis is inevitable because booms and busts are simply part of the business cycle, a leading academic told a seminar organised by Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. Dr Thomas F. Cooley, professor of economics and dean of New York University's Stern School of Business, recently spoke at a Global Finance Seminar Series event entitled "The Next Financial Crisis" at the Hong Kong Monetary Authority (HKMA) offices. Edmond Lau, executive director of the HKMA's monetary management department and a board member of the Treasury Markets Association, delivered opening remarks, while Reginald Chua, editor-in-chief of the South China Morning Post, later moderated a panel discussion between Cooley and K.K. Tse, executive vice-president of State Street Bank and Trust Company. Cooley would not say when he thought the next financial crisis would occur but said it definitely would come because booms and busts were part of the business cycle. He said the next crisis would have the same characteristics and follow the same path as the present one - flowing from a loss of confidence. "History is replete with examples of financial crises and bank panics," he said. "Just in the United States alone, in the 20th century we had the panic of 1907, the stock market crash of 1929 and banking panics of the 1930s. Then we had a long period of relative success and calm, and then we had episodes such as the savings and loan crisis, and the failures of Continental Illinois Bank and Long Term Capital Management. "That's just in the US. In the past two decades we've had financial crises in Asia, Mexico, Chile, Sweden, Norway, Finland and Russia, so financial crises occur with some frequency, but what they don't do is occur with predictability," he said.

### A2 Poverty Turn

#### Alt Cause: Oil, Food, and Warming

APA (African Press Agency). "Increase in Food, Oil Prices Driving 100 Million People Into Poverty." 30 June 2008. http://www.netnewspublisher.com/increase-in-food-oil-prices-driving-100-million-people-into-poverty/

The current food and oil price increases tabled for discussion at the African Union summit in Egypt is driving 100 million poor people into deeper poverty, the United Nations said on Monday. The majority of these people living in poverty are said to be Africans who are highly affected by the current food and oil price increases. The oil price is approaching $150 per barrel, which is expected to make the current economic crisis in the developing countries, including Africa worse. “As we speak the food crisis-compounded by the hike in fuel prices and climate change-threatens to push an estimated 100 million people deeper into poverty and will have direct bearing on our efforts to meet the Millennium Development Goals,” said Dr. Asha-Rose Migiro, Deputy Secretary General of the UN.

#### Poverty does not cause war.

The Forum. "Reading the Bible with a Pair of Scissors." 5 June 2005. http://forum.onlineopinion.com.au/thread.asp?article=3417&page=6

The niave assumption that war is caused by poverty cannot explain the Third Reich, or Japanese Imperialism. It is blatently obvious other attitudes motivated their agenda. The fact is the anxiety and displacement of persons by war is one reason for poverty, another is lack of education or resources to deal with the environment. You can give charity to some people all their life and they will never attempt to build a sustainable food source. This also happens here in Australia. Change their minds and give hope of building their own world will take them off Charity. These major problems will only be overcome with a spiritual awakening and the sweat of the brow. Poverty does not cause war, greed causes war, as does unjust oppression of the weak. The real answer is one of the mind and spirit, and not one of enforced law and the allocation of funds. There is a real need of personal enlightenment and politicians are rarely in the forefront of spiritual change.

# Trade Agreements Specific

## WTO Good

### WTO good for reducing trade conflict

#### WTO solves economic friction and trade disputes

**Hersh, 2013**

(Adam, “Instituting Economic Cooperation in a Noncooperative World”, Center for American Progress, July 2, accessed on 7/5/13, BT)

The United States should use the opportunity of the G-20 to encourage community members to revisit governance issues in the World Trade Organization, or WTO, and other international economic institutions. In particular, the United States should encourage members to revisit the effectiveness of the WTO dispute-settlement mechanism for adjudicating the rules of the trading system. A transparent, balanced, and efficient dispute-settlement process would benefit all member nations, smoothing frictions in international economic relations.

### WTO good for reducing actual conflict

#### WTO credibility key to cooperation – fosters peace and solves conflict

Blanco 2013 (Herminio Blanco, AllAfrica Staff Writer, 4-29-13, “The relevance of the World Trade Organization for Africa”, http://www.tralac.org/2013/04/29/the-relevance-of-the-world-trade-organization-for-africa/)

There is an urgent need to preserve the credibility of the WTO as a forum for negotiations among its Members and restore the full relevance of the Organization. For this, Bali should provide concrete results and a clear commitment to substantially accomplish the Doha Round at the earliest opportunity. The second step is to further tackle the Doha issues which are of high relevance for African countries. In this regard: Market Access issues of interest to African and LDC countries should be a priority. The full implementation of the political commitments undertaken in Hong Kong on Duty-Free-Quota-Free market access to products from LDCs, including by developing countries that are in a condition to do so. An effective and durable solution to the problem of cotton subsidies that affect the livelihoods of many African producers should be a must. The multilateral trading system has a vital role to play in defending the interests of and enhancing the development process of African economies. A continuous effort of consultation with and inclusion of these countries in WTO negotiations and decision-making processes is essential for the system to fulfill its objective of securing for them a share in international trade commensurate with the needs of their economic development. Bearing in mind that the WTO is not just relevant to world trade, it is vitally important to strengthen cooperation among countries and, hence, to preserve world peace, as its Director General, I would undertake the high responsibility to help Member countries move beyond these two steps and into an indispensable process of modernization of the Organization, seeking for the benefit of all its Members, but especially those of smaller size and the least developed countries of Africa.

### WTO resolves trade dispute

#### WTO Key to resolve trade disputes – adjudication system

Sutherland 2013 (Peter Sutherland, “The Bilateral Threat to Free Trade - WTO has a credibility problem”, Former Director General of GATT, WTO, Co-chair of High-level Expert Group on Trade, set up by UK, German, Turkish, and Indonesian governments to examine world trading system, 1-20-13, <http://www.neurope.eu/kn/article/bilateral-threat-free-trade-wto-has-credibility-problem>)

One of the WTO’s great achievements has been the adjudication system that it provides – the so-called Dispute Settlement Mechanism. This independent body has been a resounding success, giving the world an effective quasi-judicial system to resolve disputes between trading partners. But its continued success depends ultimately on the credibility of the WTO itself; it will inevitably suffer collateral damage from a failure of multilateral negotiations.

#### WTO helps developing countries – trade disputes

Blanco 2013 (Herminio Blanco, AllAfrica Staff Writer, 4-29-13, “The relevance of the World Trade Organization for Africa”, http://www.tralac.org/2013/04/29/the-relevance-of-the-world-trade-organization-for-africa/)

Although trade has played a key role in making Africa one of the most rapidly growing economic regions in the world, trade should become an even more powerful tool to enhance prosperity in the Continent, especially in its least developed countries. The World Trade Organization (WTO) is essential for the fulfillment of this task. Unless the African countries have not only legally bound open markets for their products, but also the technical assistance and the capacity building required for a continued growth of their exports, the export-led growth they have recently enjoyed may be compromised. The WTO has been one of the most successful international organizations, particularly in its trade surveillance and monitoring function, as well as in settling trade disputes. Unfortunately, the prolonged Doha Round impasse threatens the credibility of the organization.

### WTO helps labor

#### WTO can bring pressure to protect labor rights- FTA’s key

Stephen Joseph Powell [Professor Powell, the former Chief Counsel for Import Administration and a founding¶ NOAA Assistant General Counsel, is now Senior Lecturer in Law and Director of the¶ International Trade Law Program at the University of Florida's Levin College of Law] ¶ Aug 21, 2012¶ Beyond Labor Rights: Which Core Human Rights Must Regional Trade Agreements Protect?¶ works.bepress.com/context/stephen\_powell/article/1011/.../viewcontent

Captured within dozens of UN human rights treaties and a growing corpus of customary international norms, human rights law embraces literally hundreds of specific entitlements, each by UN guarantee designated as indivisible, interdependent, and interrelated. This foreboding array of obligations, each ostensibly of equal rank, whose legal intricacies sometimes are beyond the experience and training of trade ministries, explains the reluctance of trade negotiators to undertake the responsibility for further integration of trade rules with human rights, and does so more credibly than the oft-cited reason that trade rules succeed only when they single-mindedly pursue economic growth.¶ The breakthrough in worker rights may be attributed directly to the International Labor Organization’s endorsement, at WTO urging, of four core human rights standards inarguably tied to international trade. The ILO’s Work Declaration chooses, without downplaying the importance of the hundreds of worker protections identified in dozens of ILO conventions, those core standards for workers that are inarguably and inextricably linked to trade. This choice has freed trade negotiators to concentrate on incorporating these core worker rights in regional trade agreements, a manageable task that has met with great success.

#### WTO promotes worker rights- creates basic norms for governance that spill over the action in member nations

SUSAN ARIEL AARONSON [University of North Carolina, Kenan Institute for Private Enterprise]¶ “Seeping in slowly : how human rights concerns are penetrating the WTO”¶ World Trade Review (2007), 6: 3, 1–37¶ <http://usitc.gov/research_and_analysis/economics_seminars/2008/Aaronson.pdf>

If success is about results, then the GATT/WTO is one of the most successful¶ international organizations of the past century. In its 60-year history, it has¶ stimulated multilateral trade liberalization, settled disputes, and provided a¶ forum for ongoing trade talks. Under its aegis, trade has expanded dramatically¶ throughout the world. The ratio of world exports of goods and services to GDP¶ rose from 13.5% in 1970 to 32% in 2005. Almost every country that is not¶ yet a member (such as Russia and the Ukraine) is clamoring for admittance to this¶ 150 nation club.¶ But trade results are not the only criteria to assess the impact of the WTO.¶ In recent years, some scholars, activists, and policymakers have suggested that¶ the WTO agreements undermine the ability of member states to achieve other¶ important policy goals (Consultative Board, 2005: 10). Some of the most forceful¶ critics argue that that the WTO system of rules makes it harder for member states¶ to meet their obligations to respect, protect and advance human rights as delineated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – the code of human rights¶ developed by the members of the United Nations.1¶ They note that while the WTO¶ system has a strong system of dispute settlement, the international system of¶ human rights does not have an eﬀective universal mechanism to ensure the¶ implementation of human rights norms and principles, to assess violations, or to¶ punish violators (International Federation for Human Rights, 2001: 3). Other¶ critics argue that WTO rules signal to market actors that trade is more important¶ than speciﬁc human rights such as worker or indigenous rights.2¶ As the debate has grown louder and more vigorous, some WTO advocates¶ have tried to forcefully defend the WTO’s rules-based system. They stress that the¶ WTO governs trade and thus does not address these other policy objectives.¶ Moreover, these WTO defenders note that the GATT and the WTO stipulate rules¶ regarding what governments cannot do, not what they can do. Thus, they argue¶ that it is not surprising that these agreements do not provide guidance on how¶ WTO members can promote human rights without distorting trade (Vasquez:¶ 2003: 803; Cleveland, 2002: 188–189; and Lim, 2001: 4–5).¶ Meanwhile, some WTO defenders turn this argument on its head. They claim¶ the WTO in fact promotes human rights. They note that, over time, the GATT and¶ the WTO have stimulated trade and improved governance. As nations learn the¶ habits of good governance, they stress, policymakers learn not only to protect¶ some rights such as property rights but also to protect other rights such as political¶ participation and due process rights.3¶ Other WTO proponents, for example, the¶ WTO’s Consultative Board, argued that by simply by promoting economic¶ activity, the WTO enhances human welfare.4¶ Other scholars argue that trade and¶ human rights should exist in diﬀerent policy realms. They stress that human rights¶ issues are not trade issues and, therefore, the WTO has no authority to address¶ them (Bhagwati, 1996: 1).¶ The debate over whether the WTO promotes or undermines human rights has¶ been simplistic. Trade policies and agreements – and the trade they stimulate – can¶ undermine some rights and enhance others. Because every country is diﬀerent,¶ there is no one set way that trade aﬀects a basket of rights or a particular human¶ right. Moreover, each country’s human rights priorities and conditions may¶ change over time, reﬂecting demographics, culture and the country’s political,¶ social, and economic situations. Rather than try to assess how the WTO undermines or advances human rights, this paper seeks to examine what policymakers¶ think and do in response to pressures to promote human rights and to expand¶ trade. What does policymaker behavior tell us about the relationship between¶ human rights and trade? Do policymakers discuss human rights issues at the¶ WTO? Do they ﬁnd ways to reconcile their trade and human rights objectives¶ within the framework of WTO rules? How do they talk about human rights as¶ they try to expand trade?¶ This paper ﬁnds that WTO members increasingly seek to reconcile their trade¶ and human rights objectives. Trade policymakers have introduced human rights¶ concerns in trade policy reviews and trade disputes, negotiated waivers of WTO¶ obligations to protect human rights, and discussed human rights issues during¶ both the Doha and Uruguay Rounds of trade talks. At times, they have made it¶ clear that they view particular human rights as a policy priority. In many other¶ instances, they have struggled to ﬁnd common ground between human rights¶ and trade objectives.

### WTO helps environment

#### **WTO key actor in enforcing environmental regulation**

Busse, 2004, Matthias,“Trade, Environmental Regulations and the World Trade Organization”, Hamburg Institute of International Economics (HWWA), July 2004, <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/10thi_e/10thi08_e.htm>, 7/11/13, JG

Considering the evidence presented in the former section – in particular with respect to iron and¶ steel products – it might be argued that internationally binding environmental regulations should¶ be introduced, preferably within the WTO, to ensure a level playing field.14 In general,¶ economists recognize four fundamental principles when pondering the negotiation of a set of¶ multilateral standards to restrain government action in environmental issues (Maskus 2002).¶ More specifically, the question is posed whether differences in environmental regulations across¶ countries meet the following four principles: (1) The issue is clearly trade related such that trade¶ flows are distorted; (2) there are international externalities, such as environmental spillovers,¶ involved that limit the attainment of global optimality, and multilateral rules are an appropriate¶ way to internalize those externalities; (3) in the case of no multilateral rules, national¶ governments would choose sub-optimal policies that result in insufficient regulations or a “race¶ to the bottom” on regulations; and (4) any damages from not complying with international¶ regulations can be assessed in financial terms and, thus, allow the dispute settlement to function.¶

#### **WTO MEA agreements have provisions that protect the environment**

WTO, 2013, “8 The WTO can ... support the environment and health”, World Trade Organization, 2013, <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/10thi_e/10thi08_e.htm>, 7/11/13, JG

The Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO includes among its objectives optimal use of the world’s resources, sustainable development and environmental protection. “The Parties to this Agreement [recognize] that their relations in the field of trade and economic endeavour should be conducted with a view to raising standards of living, ensuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, and expanding the production of and trade in goods and services, while allowing for the optimal use of the world’s resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development, seeking both to protect and preserve the environment and to enhance the means for doing so in a manner consistent with their respective needs and concerns at different levels of economic development …” This is backed up by a range of provisions in the WTO’s rules. For example, they allow countries to curb trade to protect human, animal or plant life or health, and conserve exhaustible natural resources. They allow subsidies for environmental protection. These provisions can be found in more general rules and in specific agreements on product standards, food safety, intellectual property protection, and so on.¶ Reforms under the rules, such as cutting industrial and agricultural support, help to reduce waste and environmental damage, and encourage efficient use of resources.

### WTO helps global economy

#### WTO opens economies and causes them to grow faster

WTO, 2013, “3 The WTO can ... stimulate economic growth and employment”, World Trade Organization, 2013, https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/10thi\_e/10thi03\_e.htm, 7/11/13, JG

Achieving higher living standards, full employment and sustainable development is the aim of the WTO’s member governments, as expressed in the WTO’s founding Marrakesh Agreement. The means for achieving this include the “substantial reduction of tariffs and other obstacles to trade”.¶ This process of trade opening takes place in the framework of WTO rules, which take into account the fact that some countries are better equipped than others to open their markets widely. Some countries, for instance, have a more advanced legal, regulatory and physical infrastructure than others. Generally speaking,¶ it is easier for developed countries to open their markets than for many developing countries.¶ As a result, average tariffs (import duties) in developed countries, at least for manufactured goods, are much lower than in developing countries — although this is not true in every case or for every product.¶ Open economies tend to grow faster and more steadily than closed economies and economic growth is an important factor in job creation. Profitable companies tend to hire more workers than those posting a loss. Trade can also be a catalyst for greater efficiency and productivity. This is because companies¶ have access to a wider range of high-quality, affordable inputs. They also have access to technology and know-how they could not obtain in a closed economy. Access to technology and quality inputs can boost innovation and creativity in the workplace.¶ Moreover, competition in the marketplace can be a powerful stimulus to companies seeking new ways of making things better and more cheaply. An infusion of new ideas from other countries can make companies more productive. So can enhanced access to export markets. But doing things more productively often means doing more with less and that can mean using fewer workers. Inevitably, this means that some workers in some industries will lose their jobs.

#### WTO key to US accessing global trade and global trade benefits

Kenny, Fellow at the Center for Global Development and the New America Foundation, 2013, Charles, “A Stronger World Trade Organization Is Good for America”, Bloomberg Business Week Global Economics, May 20, 2013, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-05-20/a-stronger-world-trade-organization-is-good-for-america>, 7/11/13, JG

The U.S. needs global trade to work better at a time when America’s economic dominance is declining. The U.S. controlled nearly 16 percent of world trade as recently as 2000. Economist Arvind Subramanian predicts that will drop to around 7 percent by 2030 (China will control around 15 percent—as much as the U.S. and Europe combined). The best way to lock in a trading regime that will be fair to the U.S. is to use the power of the WTO. The organization has shown itself capable of standing up to today’s biggest trade bully: Washington. Economic minnows Antigua and Costa Rica have both successfully challenged U.S. trade practices using the WTO. At the same time, WTO decisions have also helped the U.S.—not least, a WTO ruling forced China to drop export taxes on a number of raw materials, including bauxite and zinc, in 2012. If the U.S. wants to benefit from a stronger, fairer, truly global trading regime, it needs to reach out beyond Europe and the Far East to producers from Africa to Asia and Latin America. Because of global production networks, it needs agreements that promote friction-free movement of goods all around the world. And only one trade institution has that reach. The WTO now has 158 members who account for more than 95 percent of world trade. Add in 32 applicant countries, and that brings the total to 99.95 percent. For all of the frustrations of the past 10 years, the Obama Administration should be putting its muscle behind reviving the moribund Doha WTO round—or launching a new one. Regional and bilateral agreements are simply a distraction.

### WTO helps human rights standards

#### WTO provides a framework in which HR can be advanced

Susan Ariel Aaronson [Associate Research Professor of International Affairs, George Washington University]¶ 20 January 2009¶ Seeping in slowly: The WTO and human rights¶ <http://www.voxeu.org/article/seeping-slowly-wto-and-human-rights>

Rather than try to assess whether the WTO undermines or advances human rights, I have examined what the member states do in response to pressures to promote human rights and trade.[3](http://www.voxeu.org/article/seeping-slowly-wto-and-human-rights#fn3)Specifically, I have focused on how these nations behave at the WTO in response to these concerns.¶ I found that human rights are seeping into WTO activities. Members of the WTO are learning how to achieve both policy goals. Officials have at times found ways to clarify or rewrite WTO rules to ensure that national policymakers had space to achieve trade and human rights objectives. It is not easy.¶ Table 1. Where human rights may enter the WTO System Nations have not introduced human rights concerns per se in accessions, but some members have become increasingly concerned about human rights and in particular, the rule of law in acceding countries. In China’s accession, it was asked to enforce all of its laws in all of its territories including export-processing zones. When nations accede, WTO members may choose not to extend trading rights and privileges. Article XX includes language allowing nations to restrict trade when necessary to protect life, protect public morals, secure compliance, or conserve natural resources. Article XXI allows member states to restrict trade for reasons of national security. The Kimberley waiver for conflict diamonds was the first waiver approved for a human rights purpose. It was stimulated by UN Security Council Resolution and broad member interest and support. There have been no disputes that centred directly on human rights questions. The first dispute on public morals was in 2005. Food safety disputes to some degree centre on the right to health (but are not explicitly defended as human rights concerns). The WTO Secretariat and member states jointly review trade policies and practices of member states. Larger trading nations are reviewed more frequently. Officials increasingly bring up human rights concerns in these discussions. Amendments to existing agreements or clarification WTO members recognise there are times when they need to provide greater guidance to member states. In amendments, members agree to alter existing agreements to stipulate what member states can or cannot do, as in intellectual property rights (IPR) and the right to health. In addition, members have agreed to further discussions to clarify the relationship between IPR and traditional knowledge.4 Some members sought to include labour rights in negotiations, but failed. There are no direct human rights negotiations in Doha Round, but many issues such as agriculture and services could affect the ability of governments to advance human rights positively or negatively. As these negotiations are in progress, they are not discussed herein. ¶ Human rights issues are constantly seeping into the workings of the WTO. For example, the US tried to prod Vietnam to agree to certain labour rights conditions during its accession negotiations. Vietnam refused, but it did seek the help of the International Labour Organisation and World Bank to improve its monitoring of labour rights. During the first days of the Doha Round in 2001, members agreed to amend the TRIPS agreement to ensure access to affordable medicines among member states. In response to UN concerns, in 2003, WTO members worked to ensure that trade in diamonds did not fuel conflict or human rights abuse in countries such as the Congo or Sierra Leone. Under the Kimberley process waiver, member states agreed to waive WTO rules and trade only diamonds certified to not have been produced in conditions of human rights abuse.

WTO’s Article XX protects human rights

Paquette, Master of Professional Studies in International Relations & Human Rights Candidate, 2012, Aaron, “The WTO and Human Rights Obligations: Harmonizing Trade Liberalization with

Core Labour Standards”, October 23rd 2012, <http://www.humanrights.auckland.ac.nz/webdav/site/humanrights/shared/Research/WTO-Human-Rights-Obligations.pdf>, 7/11/13, JG

The Article XX: General Exemptions are a list of criteria that authorize individual¶ country governments to restrict the trade of goods and services that have been found to¶ threaten public morals, human, animal or plant life or health, cultural treasures, or¶ exhaustible natural resources, among others.10 As previously discussed, the five core¶ labour standards have achieved a greater recognition of universality and therefore an¶ importing country could make the argument that violations of core labour rights constitutes a threat to “public morals” under Art XX(a) or “human health” under Art¶ XX(b).11¶ However, despite a seemingly clear line of reasoning in establishing human¶ rights and core labour standards as safeguarding universal public morals or human¶ health, there has yet to be a WTO ruling on the interpretation of Art XX(a)12 and Art¶ XX(b) in regard to preserving public morals or human health as a result of poor labour¶ standards.¶ Nevertheless, just because there is an absence of case law interpreting Art XX(a)¶ or Art XX(b) in regard to violations of core labour standards, one need not argue that the¶ Article is void of potential. Furthermore, it is plausible that no case has arisen because¶ no Member State has complained for fear of establishing a negative precedent. This¶ observation is the purpose of this essay.

#### WTO facilitates human rights protection

Aaron Paquette [Master of Professional Studies – International Relations & Human Rights Candidate] ¶ The University of Auckland¶ 23 October 2012¶ <http://www.humanrights.auckland.ac.nz/webdav/site/humanrights/shared/Research/WTO-Human-Rights-Obligations.pdf>

In this essay, I will demonstrate that core labour standards are universal human ¶ rights that could be strengthened through WTO practices. However, I will also stress ¶ that the implementation of trade sanctions against violators of core labour standards is ¶ ultimately dependent on individual government action, not the WTO. The prospect for ¶ strengthening international labour standards lies in the improvement of horizontal ¶ coordination between the International Labour Organization (ILO), the WTO, the UN ¶ Charter and treaty bodies and relevant governments.¶ In 1919, at the conclusion of the Treaty of Versailles, the ILO was created in ¶ order to establish international labour standards and investigate labour issues. The ILO ¶ was not empowered to impose sanctions on governments for violations of international¶ labour standards. It was designed solely to collect information and register complaints ¶ against recognized government violations. The ILO has persisted into the modern era ¶ without significant institutional reforms. Although the ILO is not equipped to authorize ¶ sanctions, it can inform and advise governments in their individual determination of ¶ sanctions. Furthermore, individual governments may wish to utilize existing human ¶ rights instruments to further legitimate their use of sanctions. As such, the ILO may also inform and advise treaty bodies, such as the Committee on Economic, Social & Cultural¶ Rights of the International Covenant on Economic Social & Cultural Rights (ICESCR) ¶ and the Human Rights Committee of the International Covenant on Civil & Political ¶ Rights (ICCPR) in their determinations of breaches of human rights which could ¶ facilitate the coordination of a multilateral effort to impose sanctions on countries that ¶ continue to violate core labour standards.

#### WTO creates behavioral norms for the protection of human rights

Abouharb, M. Rodwan [Senior Lecturer in International Relation, UCL]¶ The Paradox of the WTO: Development, Good Governance and Human Rights. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Submission Sept 2014)¶ The Paradox of the WTO: Development, Good Governance and Human Rights¶ <http://rodabouharb.com/book/the-paradox-of-the-wto-development-good-governance-and-human-rights/>

In this book, we argue that the WTO directly obligates member states to act in certain ways that reflect its norms of good governance and democratic rights. We believe these obligations/norms may spill over into the polity as a whole (we call this direct diffusion). The members of the WTO also discuss and at times address other issues of human rights and good governance such as promoting labor rights, empowering women, and reducing corruption. We seek to see if WTO member states indirectly diffuse these norms, which are not WTO obligations, in the day to day workings of the WTO.¶ We examine what member states say and do at the WTO (our qualitative analysis). To test the effects of direct diffusion on member states governance, we examine member states performance on metrics of democratic rights and governance. Likewise to to test the effects of indirect diffusion on member states governance, we examine member state performance on metrics of labor rights, women’s rights, and corruption. By comparing what member states say and what they do with member state performance on these metrics, we can provide readers with a more comprehensive picture of the WTO.

### A2 “WTO Won’t Protect Human Rights”

#### WTO trade regulations aren’t what should guarantee human rights- states have the duty to protect rights

Aaron Paquette [Master of Professional Studies – International Relations & Human Rights Candidate] ¶ The University of Auckland¶ 23 October 2012¶ <http://www.humanrights.auckland.ac.nz/webdav/site/humanrights/shared/Research/WTO-Human-Rights-Obligations.pdf>

To argue that the WTO has failed explicitly to outlaw the trade of goods and ¶ services that impinges on core labour standards is misguided. Contrary to the belief of ¶ critics, the WTO rules do not supersede the responsibility of States to abide by their ¶ other treaty obligations with respect to human rights, including core labour standards. ¶ In the end the onus is on individual governments to decide which human rights ¶ instruments or institutional arrangements are best suited to advance core labour ¶ standards. And the ILO should continue to investigate alleged violations of core labour ¶ standards and advise individual governments, WTO member States, and UN human ¶ rights committees on best practices. The UN Human Rights Council and other human ¶ rights treaty committees should continue to investigate and call to governments’¶ attention violations of human rights. ¶ The WTO should continue pursuing its mandate to lower the barriers to trade and ¶ liberalize the multilateral trading system. But this does not preclude the WTO members ¶ from seeking to promote human rights and core labour standards. Improved ¶ consultation between the ILO, the UN Human Rights Council, human rights treaty committees and the WTO member governments could improve the ability of each and ¶ all to implement policies that can reduce barriers to trade of goods and services and ¶ simultaneously avoid undermining the fundamental human rights of workers.

## WTO Bad

### WTO bad – General

#### **WTO creates a plutocracy in the United States**

Heffner, 2013, Thomas, “We Must Get Out of the World Trade Organization (WTO)!”, Economy in Crisis, June 18th 2013, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/we-must-get-out-of-the-world-trade-organization-wto>, 7/11/13, JG

When we signed this document, it effectively took control of our country out of our hands and put it into the hands of a foreign organization.¶ Now this foreign group controls much of our economy and is the cause of many of our major problems. Unbeknownst to most of us, including many of our own legislators, when we misguidedly signed this agreement we signed away our own Constitution, allowing it to be usurped by their charter.¶ Through this agreement, our leaders agreed to concede a major portion of our sovereignty and negate our democratic legislative process, by:¶ Conforming U.S. laws, regulations and administrative procedures to the will of the WTO (Article XVI, p. 10)¶ Subjecting all federal, state and local laws and practices that affect trade to international review by the WTO (Article XVI, p. 10)¶ Allowing any WTO member country to challenge federal, state and local laws and practices as trade impeding (Section 2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding)¶ Taking all trade disputes to the WTO judiciary, giving the WTO final jurisdiction over all trade disputes. No appeal exists outside of the WTO (Section 2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding)¶ Empowering the WTO to enforce its rulings by imposing fines on the United States until we comply¶ Disallowing Congress to change this agreement.¶ Why would we do something as irresponsible and damaging as this?¶ Quietly but relentlessly America is slipping from being a democracy to becoming a full fledged plutocracy, a country run by the rich or special interests for their exclusive benefit at the expense of the country and its citizenry. It was facilitated by the Supreme Court’s Citizens United ruling that allows unlimited campaign contributions in all elections.¶ The Citizens United ruling compounded the problem by opening the door to unbridled, selective campaign donations, and cementing a political culture where lawmakers cannot afford to neglect donors with unlimited amounts of money. Once elected the politicians are beholden to the will of their donors, rather than the will of the people who elected them. A grassroots campaign of concerned citizens stands little chance of competitively funding a candidate against a group of multinational corporations with unlimited amounts of money to fund campaigns and elect their chosen legislators who will then vote as directed by their sponsors.¶ There is still time to amend or leave the World Trade Organization. If American citizens truly desire a self-managed, prosperous economic future, either we amend our agreement with the WTO or we cancel it.

#### **WTO rulings against the US stagnate US competitiveness in the world market**

Moreland, 2013, James, “Is the World Trade Organization (WTO) Running Our Country?”, Economy in Crisis, February 2nd 2013, <http://economyincrisis.org/content/is-the-world-trade-organization-wto-running-our-country>, 7/11/13, JG

Since its creation in 1995, the WTO has been a major obstacle in America’s ability to stay competitive in the world market. Our nation has become handcuffed— forced to increase free trade with countries that have few to no laws regarding workers’ rights, child labor or environmental protection. This means these countries can manufacture at a vastly lower rate, and American companies will have no choice but to do business with them in order to stay competitive.¶ The United States government has tried on countless occasions to protect our industries, but the World Trade Organization (WTO) regularly rules against us. In fact, the U.S. loses nine out of every 10 cases brought to the WTO—requiring changes to laws, and damaging the American economy.¶ There are many examples of WTO rulings against the U.S.:¶ In 2002, Brazil challenged U.S. federal subsidies on its imported Brazilian cotton. The WTO ruled against the U.S., and eventually gave Brazil permission to impose tariffs totaling nearly $830 million on American-made products such as cars, textiles, electronics and media.¶ In 2010, the U.S. attempted to ban uninspected chicken products from China that may be harmful or toxic. The WTO ruled against the U.S., stating that the ban was not in accordance with its regulations, and putting American consumers in harm’s way.¶ In 1995, Venezuela challenged U.S. regulations on imported gasoline. The WTO ruled against the U.S., preventing us from protecting our oil manufacturers.¶ In 2004, two Caribbean states challenged U.S. prohibitions on cross-border gambling, a ban put in place to protect against money laundering and other dangerous exposures. The WTO ruled against the U.S., stating the ban breached a global deal which liberalized trade in services — in this case being online casinos.¶ In 2010, anti-dumping duties imposed by the U.S. on Brazilian orange juice were challenged. The WTO ruled against U.S., opening the door for around $400 million dollars in Brazilian orange juice to be shipped there each year.¶ This year the WTO ruled against U.S. laws that protected American consumers by placing country of origin labels on certain foods. Now, thanks to the WTO, American consumers do not know where their food comes from, and are not able to protect themselves from potentially contaminated foreign food.¶ As long as the United States is ruled by the WTO, these problems are not going to go away. U.S. leaders need to request an emergency timeout from these trade pacts, a procedure for which the WTO has a clearly established process. Also, either Congress or the president could initiate an end to the United States’ WTO membership altogether.¶ America needs to take action immediately in order to stop the WTO from holding its hammer above the entire nation’s head.¶

### WTO bad for reducing trade conflict

#### WTO dispute settlement takes forever- undermines its power

Jonathan S. Kallmer [counsel in Crowell & Moring's International Trade and International Dispute Resolution Groups]¶ Matthew R. Nicely [partner in the International Trade and Customs practice group of Hughes, Hubbard & Reed LLP]¶ AND Sean Upson [partner in the Commercial Litigation Department and the International Arbitration Department of Stewarts Law LLP] TalkingPoint: International Trade Disputes July 2013 http://www.financierworldwide.com/article.php?id=10868

Nicely: In the first several years of the WTO’s existence, it was common to see large economies challenging one another ­– Japan v. US, US v. EU, India v. EU, Brazil v. US, and so on. Today, it is becoming more and more common to see developing countries challenging one another, such as ­Panama v. Colombia, Costa Rica v. Dominican Republic, as well as challenging developed countries, for instance Antigua and Barbuda v. US, and Vietnam v. US. Further, as mentioned, the most common disputes in the WTO context involve trade remedies. What has changed in recent years is that a greater number of countries are using their trade remedy laws more frequently – and not doing so very well. So, while the US continues to be the favourite target of disputes over its use of trade remedies – in part because of its stubborn use of the 'zeroing' methodology in dumping cases and its application of the countervailing duty laws to non-market economies – other countries like China are now also being challenged for their poorly administered trade remedy laws. Unfortunately, I think this reflects a view by many countries that they can apply these laws sloppily and not be forced to fix them until well after two or more years have passed. This is because there is no injunctive relief to stop the application of trade remedy measures; and, while the WTO’s dispute settlement system has teeth – allowing trade retaliation when a country does not comply – it takes a long time to reach the point where a country has to pay for its sins. In the meantime, import relief remains in place. The lack of a rule of law mentality among members to the WTO arguably undermines the important principles on which the organisation is based.

#### WTO wildly biased against the US, we lose 9/10 disputes

JAMES MORELAND [writing for Economy in Crisis- online financial analysis outlet] Is the World Trade Organization (WTO) Running Our Country?¶ FEBRUARY 02, 2013 ¶ <http://economyincrisis.org/content/is-the-world-trade-organization-wto-running-our-country>

Since its creation in 1995, the WTO has been a major obstacle in America’s ability to stay competitive in the world market. Our nation has become handcuffed— forced to increase free trade with countries that have few to no laws regarding workers’ rights, child labor or environmental protection. This means these countries can manufacture at a vastly lower rate, and American companies will have no choice but to do business with them in order to stay competitive.¶ The United States government has tried on countless occasions to protect our industries, but the World Trade Organization (WTO) regularly rules against us. In fact, the U.S. loses nine out of every 10 cases brought to the WTO—requiring changes to laws, and damaging the American economy.¶ There are many examples of WTO rulings against the U.S.:¶ In 2002, Brazil challenged U.S. federal subsidies on its imported Brazilian cotton. The WTO ruled against the U.S., and eventually gave Brazil permission to impose tariffs totaling nearly $830 million on American-made products such as cars, textiles, electronics and media.¶ In 2010, the U.S. attempted to ban uninspected chicken products from China that may be harmful or toxic. The WTO ruled against the U.S., stating that the ban was not in accordance with its regulations, and putting American consumers in harm’s way.¶ In 1995, Venezuela challenged U.S. regulations on imported gasoline. The WTO ruled against the U.S., preventing us from protecting our oil manufacturers.¶ In 2004, two Caribbean states challenged U.S. prohibitions on cross-border gambling, a ban put in place to protect against money laundering and other dangerous exposures. The WTO ruled against the U.S., stating the ban breached a global deal which liberalized trade in services — in this case being online casinos.¶ In 2010, anti-dumping duties imposed by the U.S. on Brazilian orange juice were challenged. The WTO ruled against U.S., opening the door for around $400 million dollars in Brazilian orange juice to be shipped there each year.¶ This year the WTO ruled against U.S. laws that protected American consumers by placing country of origin labels on certain foods. Now, thanks to the WTO, American consumers do not know where their food comes from, and are not able to protect themselves from potentially contaminated foreign food.¶ As long as the United States is ruled by the WTO, these problems are not going to go away. U.S. leaders need to request an emergency timeout from these trade pacts, a procedure for which the WTO has a clearly established process. Also, either Congress or the president could initiate an end to the United States’ WTO membership altogether.



#### WTO is biased- allows developing nations to run over the US in dispute settlement

Rob Hotakainen [columnist for Charlotte Observer]¶ As trade rulings against U.S. mount, backlash builds against WTO¶ June 14, 2013¶ <http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2012/11/28/4106806/as-trade-rulings-against-us-mount.html>

If you look closely at the can of tuna in your cupboard, there’s a good chance you’ll spot a small label that says “dolphin safe.”¶ In 1990, in a big win for environmentalists, Congress passed a law that created the labels, hoping to assure consumers that their tuna had been caught without using fishing methods that hurt dolphins. Now those labels might be disappearing, thanks to a ruling by the World Trade Organization, which said they harmed Mexico by restricting global trade. After losing the case on appeal, the United States must respond by July 13.¶ “Consumers in the U.S. have been clear: They want dolphin-safe tuna, and if we’re not able to label tuna in the way we want to label it, I think U.S. consumers are going to be pretty angry,” said Democratic Rep. Rick Larsen of Washington state, who likened the situation to having replacement referees decide the outcome of games in the National Football League.¶ In the most recent development, Larsen and 21 other members of Congress sent a letter last month to U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk, complaining that the WTO is threatening to turn back the clock to the days when tens of thousands of dolphins were killed each year "in a tuna fishing free-for-all."¶ Critics say the WTO is running roughshod over U.S. laws that govern everything from the environment to food safety and public health.¶ In 2008, for example, Congress approved the Country of Origin Labeling Act. It requires grocers to tell consumers where their meat, fish, chicken and produce came from. But the WTO said the labels unfairly hurt imports from Canada and Mexico.¶ In 2009, Congress banned flavored cigarettes with its Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. The WTO ruled against the United States again after Indonesia complained that the law discriminated against its cigarettes.¶ Both those cases are ongoing.¶ “Right now, the United States has become a punching bag for smaller nations. . . . They’re using the WTO for all kinds of things for what it was not intended to do,” said Joel Joseph, the general counsel of the Los Angeles-based Made in the USA Foundation, a group that promotes products manufactured in the U.S. and that advocates for labeling laws. In September, the group joined with the Ranchers-Cattlemen Action Legal Fund, which represents 5,400 ranchers and cattlemen in 45 states, and the Boulder, Colo., food distributor Mile High Organics to file a lawsuit in federal court in Colorado to defend the country-of-origin labeling law.

#### WTO dispute settlement power is weak- the US doesn’t respect it and WTO can’t force action

Digital Granma International [Latin American news outlet] July 4, 2013¶ Various countries support Cuba’s WTO claim¶ <http://www.granma.cu/ingles/cuba-i/4jul-h-club.html>

A number of countries are supporting Cuba in its reiterated claim against the United States for the theft of the Havana Club trademark and that country’s failure to meet its obligations to the World Trade Organization (WTO).¶ Addressing the WTO Dispute Settlement Panel, Anayansi Rodríguez, the Cuban ambassador in Geneva, noted that Washington has been ignoring the recommendations of the organization for 11 years.¶ In February 2002, the Dispute Settlement Panel ruled that Section 211 of the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998, which protects the theft of the Havana Club trademark, is incompatible with the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, and with the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.¶ Nevertheless, the U.S. government has not made any effort to respect its WTO obligations and thus the Bacardi Company continues fraudulently utilizing the Havana Club label for marketing a rum which is not of Cuban origin, Anayansi Rodríguez noted.¶ "It is not possible to ignore the concerns of Cuba and a significant and growing number of members believe that acts such as this endanger the credibility and effectiveness of the dispute settlement system," she observed.

### WTO bad for reducing actual conflict

#### WTO a breeding ground for conflict

**Chase 2012**

(Claude, an attorney specialising in international trade and investment law and recently served an internship at the WTO, “NORM CONFLICT BETWEEN WTO COVERED AGREEMENTS—REAL, APPARENT OR AVOIDED,” International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 11-27-12, EBSCOhost, 7-6-13)//KC

The basic structure of the WTO Agreement as briefly outlined above provides a fertile ground and an enabling environment for potential conflict or overlap in the application of WTO norms. The approach taken by negotiators during the Uruguay Round was to opt for a single package of multilateral trade agreements that were annexed to the WTO Agreement. The result is a single undertaking, ie, a single package of agreements that is equally binding on all Members of the WTO. Accession to the WTO, ipso fact, means acceptance of all the rights and obligations contained in all of the multilateral agreements annexed to the WTO Agreement. The single undertaking approach that characterized the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations represented a regulatory shift in multilateral trade regulation. In the Tokyo Round, the adoption of autonomous Codes which dealt with GATT-related topics arguably undermined the coherence of the GATT because many Members of the GATT were not party to and, consequently, not bound by these Codes. 5 Thus, the single undertaking approach, which has been dubbed an ingenious device 6 , avoids the so-called GATT à la carte problem associated with the Tokyo Round and purports to foster coherence between interrelated agreements. The thrust of the single undertaking approach may be seen as a recognition that the WTO Agreement, as an integrated whole, is stronger than the sum of its constituent parts. In one 3 Norm con fl ict between WTO covered agreements 795 of its fi rst reports, the Appellate Body underscored the fact that the WTO Agreement is an integrated multilateral system of trade rules, in contrast to the GATT system which preceded it. 7 The provisions of these agreements represent ‘an inseparable package of rights and disciplines which have to be considered in conjunction ’ .

### WTO hurts labor standards

#### WTO allows industrial nations to undermine the advantage of lower-wage trade

Bolle, Specialist in International Trade and Finance, 2013, Mary Jane, “Overview of Labor Enforcement Issues in Free Trade Agreements”, Congressional Research Service, January 31st 2013, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RS22823.pdf>, 7/11/13, JG

In 1996, backed by the United States and other developed countries, the then-124-member WTO¶ debated whether to form a committee to look into the relationship between trade and labor¶ standards. Developing countries, in the majority, argued that the issue had no place in the WTO¶ framework; was little more than a smokescreen for protectionism; and was a bid by industrial¶ nations to undermine the comparative advantage of lower-wage trading partners.5 Ultimately they¶ prevailed. The Singapore Ministerial Declaration, reporting on what they decided, stated that the¶ ILO (rather than the WTO) would be the “competent body to set and deal with ... internationally¶ recognized core labor standards.”6 The ILO has no enforcement tools, but rather promotes labor¶ standards through consensus, moral suasion, and technical assistance.

#### WTO fails to prevent trade-related labor exploitation in developing countries

Paquette, Master of Professional Studies in International Relations & Human Rights Candidate, 2012, Aaron, “The WTO and Human Rights Obligations: Harmonizing Trade Liberalization with

Core Labour Standards”, October 23rd 2012, <http://www.humanrights.auckland.ac.nz/webdav/site/humanrights/shared/Research/WTO-Human-Rights-Obligations.pdf>, 7/11/13, JG

In the modern era, human rights crusaders view the increasing use of lower-cost¶ labour in today’s developing countries as evidence of sanctioned First World¶ exploitation of the world’s poorest and most desperate people. The WTO, as the leading¶ international trade body, has come under scrutiny by human rights groups for its failure¶ to prevent any and all cases of perceived trade-related labour exploitation in developing¶ countries. What human rights groups tend to overlook is that developed countries have¶ attempted to establish a concrete link between trade and core labour standards, but¶ have been rebuffed by developing countries who claim that the imposition of improved¶ labour standards amounts to nothing more than veiled protectionism

### WTO hurts environment

#### WTO policies empirically harm the environment

**Mukherjee and Chakraborty 2013**

(Sacchidananda and Debashis, Both Assistant Professors at the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, “Negative Influence of Fiscal Subsidies on Environment:

Empirical Evidence from Cross-Country Estimation,” National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, January 2013, 7-9-13, http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/30887710/WP-2013\_117.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIR6FSIMDFXPEERSA&Expires=1373419501&Signature=xG9L%2BSjUUJAGPxa8hteZe0mFiKk%3D&response-content-disposition=inline)//KC

The realization on the long term adverse implications of subsidies on trade front has motivated inclusion of the ‘ Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures’ (ASCM) under the wings of WTO since its inception in 1995. This has been in continuation of the GATT negotiations being held earlier since Tokyo Round in seventies. The ASCM considers not only the direct financial transfers, but also the revenue foregone (e.g. , interest payment on loan restructuring) as subsidies (WTO, 1994) . The WTO discussion aims at classifying the subsidies under two broad categories, namely, actionable (i.e., subsidies which are directly linked with production and hence trade distorting) and non actionable (i.e., subsidies which are not directly linked with production and hence with minimal impact on trade). At present, the focus of the negotiation by WTO Member countries revolves around the need to contain the actionable subsidies being provided by the Member countries (Cha kraborty et al . , 2011) . When market prices of natural resources do not reflect the full social costs of production, distortions in trade and/or environmental degradation are bound to happen (Porter, 1997). In addition to the more obvious trade distorting effects, both domestic or export subsidies are potentially associated with over production , resource over exploitation and the consequent irreversible environmental damage. Notably, the subsidies being provided in the area of agricultural sector and the fisheries deserve special mention in this regard. Overproduction in both these sectors, aided by subsidies, may have ser ious adverse implications for the environment apart from their trade consequences . In addition, subsidies provided to the manufacturing sector, especially through fuel subsidies (i.e., allowing higher volume of fossil fuel burning) may lead to air pollution and emissions of greenhouse gases and ultimately to environmental degradation and loss of biodiversity. Apart from direct subsidies and/or tax exemptions (concessions) to producers, not adopting strict environmental rules and regulations and by not having institutional and infrastructural facilitates to monitor pollution abatement practices, a government provides implicit cost subsidies to producers who eventually externalize the environmental costs of production to the society in terms of environmental degradation ( e.g., water and air pollution , land degradation ) and / or depletion of natural resources ( e.g., falling groundwater level ) ( Templet, 2001)

### WTO hurts global economy

#### WTO policies cause economic inequalities.

LRAN (Land Research Action Network). "How the World Trade Organisation is driving farmers into poverty." 1 July 2007. http://www.landaction.org/spip/spip.php?article261

Discredited "trade liberalisation" policies are not only endangering agricultural industries throughout the world but also threatening the environment, according to a powerful new book. Restrictions imposed by the World Trade Organisation on governments to prevent them subsidising their own country’s agriculture (and protecting it from the dumping of cheap imports) should be abolished, it says. Instead they should be able to develop their own agriculture to suit its conditions. It documents the double standards of countries such as America which insist other countries are not allowed to subsidise agriculture but then find ways to subsidise their own. Even then, the subsidies benefit multinational corporations rather than farmers, who are being driven out of business. Peter M Rosset’s book, "Food is different: why we must get the WTO out of agriculture", is dedicated to Lee Kyung Hae, the South Korean co-operative farm leader who stabbed himself to death outside WTO talks in Mexico. Wearing a banner declaring ’WTO kills farmers’, he was protesting at this undemocratic institution opening his country to cheap imports which had resulted in the price of rice being cut to a quarter, driving him and millions of others off the land (even after they had increased productivity).

### WTO hurts human rights standards

WTO policies cause poverty.

LRAN (Land Research Action Network). "How the World Trade Organisation is driving farmers into poverty." 1 July 2007. http://www.landaction.org/spip/spip.php?article261

Discredited "trade liberalisation" policies are not only endangering agricultural industries throughout the world but also threatening the environment, according to a powerful new book. Restrictions imposed by the World Trade Organisation on governments to prevent them subsidising their own country’s agriculture (and protecting it from the dumping of cheap imports) should be abolished, it says. Instead they should be able to develop their own agriculture to suit its conditions. It documents the double standards of countries such as America which insist other countries are not allowed to subsidise agriculture but then find ways to subsidise their own. Even then, the subsidies benefit multinational corporations rather than farmers, who are being driven out of business. Peter M Rosset’s book, "Food is different: why we must get the WTO out of agriculture", is dedicated to Lee Kyung Hae, the South Korean co-operative farm leader who stabbed himself to death outside WTO talks in Mexico. Wearing a banner declaring ’WTO kills farmers’, he was protesting at this undemocratic institution opening his country to cheap imports which had resulted in the price of rice being cut to a quarter, driving him and millions of others off the land (even after they had increased productivity).

#### WTO increases poverty and hurts human rights standards

**The Insider 03** (“WTO cartel cause more starvation, suffering and death,” *The Insider*, 9/10/2003, <http://www.theinsider.org/news/article.asp?id=0407>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The governments of wealthy countries actively and knowingly use their wealth and influence to ensure that the poorest countries and the poorest people on Earth stay poor, while the richest men grow richer. The majority of the world's population are poor, and the people who live in rich nations are blissfully ignorant of the crimes against humanity that their governments are purpetrating in their names. "Poor countries hold 40 per cent of the world's population, but receive only 3 per cent of the world's income from trade. Rich countries make up 14 per cent of world population and yet get 75 per cent of the profit from trade." Rich countries force poorer countries to sell the same products at lower prices than rich countries, by charging exporters many times more import tax simply because they live in a poor country. It would be no exaggeration to describe this practice as "evil" or "disgraceful" or "corrupt." The world's richest nations, especially America and in Europe, deliberately pay their farmers to produce too far much food at artificially low prices to prevent the world's poorest farmers from being able to compete. The European Union spends half of its entire budget on unnecessary and unethical anti-competitive subsidies. The people in rich countries do not benefit from the unfair trade practices implemented by their leaders, in fact it is the public who have to pay for it. The average family pays $1,000 each year in taxes to the world's most wealthy farmers, while farmers in poor countries farmers suffer in poverty. No wonder taxes are so high. Why should the wealthy men who run big corporations in affluent countries exploit people in poorer countries, forcing them to work harder for less money than the richer people back home? It does not have to be like this. There is no justification for it. It is simply cheaper and easier at this point in time for imperial Western governments to control and oppress countries outside their exclusive globalization club in this way than it would be to do so militarily.

## Regional Agreements

### Mercosur Good

#### Mercosur promotes education integration

**Kroth 2013**

(Olivia, Pravda journalist, “Venezuela's entry enhances Mercosur,” pravda, 8-8-12, 7-11-13, http://english.pravda.ru/business/finance/08-08-2012/121865-venezuela\_mercosur-0)//KC

Mercosur is a free trade area with a fixed common external tariff (CET). The bloc promotes free transit of goods and services, coordinating agriculture, communications, taxes and transport of its member states. Mercosur allows free movement of capital and manpower, granting each member state equal rights and duties. Venezuela will have four years to adapt to all Mercosur norms, especially to the common external tariff (CET) which is fixed at 10 percent. Venezuela will also have to eliminate all tariffs for Mercosur countries within the given timeline of four years. The institutional structure of Mercosur is defined by five public agencies: The Common Market Council conducts its policy and is responsible for compliance with the objects and time frames. The Common Market Group is the executive body of Mercosur. It coordinates, organizes and supervises all work subgroups. The Administrative Office keeps all Mercosur documents and bulletins in Portuguese and Spanish. The Joint Parliamentary Committee has both advisory and decision making functions. The Trade Commission follows up on the development of issues and proposes guidelines. Mercosur Headquarters are located in Montevideo, Uruguay. At the Summit, Uruguay's President, José "Pepe" Mujica, reminded the others in his speech that they should not forget but include "los olvidados," those human beings who are easily forgotten, the workers, the afro-descendents, the indigenous groups, all those who walk about in "shirts and sandals." He emphasized that Latin America holds "a historic debt" to include all of its citizens, rich or poor, in order to build a just and egalitarian society with solidarity among all human beings. On another, more commercial note, he announced that he was glad about a new deal between Uruguay and Venezuela. The commercial maritime route connecting Venezuela with Santos in Brasil will be prolonged to reach Montevideo in Uruguay as well. It will give new impulses to commercial activities between the Caribbean Sea and the South Atlantic, President Mujica believes. Currently, the commercial fleet on this route consists of three ships. They will transport mainly rice and medical supplies between Caracas and Montevideo. President Mujica pointed out that Uruguay imports 20 percent of its petroleum from Venezuela. "It is not only that Venezuela now enters Mercosur, but also that Mercosur enters Venezuela, which is a country of strategic value for Latin America," José "Pepe" Mujica stated. A fact that might be overlooked, but is equally important, is Mercosur's objective to promote educational integration as a fundamental factor for the regional integration process. Educational courses at the primary and secondary level are recognized by all member states. They issue educational certificates which are valid everywhere within the bloc, allowing students to conclude their studies in different locations of the Mercosur territory. Completed studies are certified by using an equivalency table to determine the level achieved.

### Mercosur Bad

#### Venezuela has an anti business environment now

Susan Kaufman Purcell¶ [Director, Center for Hemispheric Policy¶ University of Miami]¶ JUNE 2013¶ LATIN AMERICA’S SUPPORT FOR ROBERTO AZEVEDO¶ <https://umshare.miami.edu/web/wda/hemisphericpolicy/Publications/June%202013%20-%20Reasons%20for%20Support%20(USE).pdf>

Mercosur, in contrast, is in decline. It peaked about 15 ¶ years ago, when exports within the bloc accounted for ¶ about 25% of trade among its members. During the past ¶ decade, this figure has fallen to around 15%. Argentina ¶ and Brazil have become considerably more protectionist ¶ in recent years, using tariffs, taxes and other measures to ¶ protect their domestic economies against each other and ¶ against foreign competitors. Furthermore, Mercosur has ¶ to negotiate as a bloc and has signed few free trade ¶ agreements with other countries or regions. Those that it ¶ has signed are basic and seem to have been signed more ¶ for ideological reasons. For much of its existence,¶ Mercosur was committed to admitting only democratic ¶ countries. The expulsion of Paraguay for undemocratic ¶ behavior, and the inclusion of Venezuela, despite its ¶ undemocratic behavior, have weakened the group’s ¶ democratic identity. In addition, in Argentina and ¶ Venezuela the rules and regulations affecting business,¶ investment and private property have become arbitrary ¶ and easily changed. As a result, foreign investment in ¶ both countries has been declining.

### NAFTA Good

#### NAFTA key to economy

**U.S. Chamber of Commerce 12** (“NAFTA Triumphant Assessing Two Decades of Gains in Trade, Growth, and Jobs,” *U.S. Chamber of Commerce*, <http://www.uschamber.com/reports/nafta-triumphant-20-years-assessing-two-decades-gains-trade-growth-and-jobs>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

As the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) marks its 20th anniversary this year, it’s critical to understand how the agreement has generated vast new opportunities for U.S. workers, farmers, consumers, and businesses. Since NAFTA entered into force in 1994, trade with Canada and Mexico has risen three-and-one-half fold to $1.2 trillion, and the two countries buy about one-third of U.S. merchandise exports. Trade with Canada and Mexico supports nearly 14 million U.S. jobs, and nearly 5 million of these net jobs are supported by the increase in trade generated by NAFTA, according to a comprehensive economic study commissioned by the U.S. Chamber. The expansion of trade unleashed by NAFTA supports tens of thousands of jobs in each of the 50 states—and more than 100,000 jobs in each of 17 states. NAFTA has been a boon to the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturers, which added more than 800,000 jobs in the four years after NAFTA entered into force. Canadians and Mexicans purchased $428 billion of U.S. manufactured goods in 2011, generating $36,000 in export revenue for every American factory worker. NAFTA has been a bonanza for U.S. farmers and ranchers, helping U.S. agricultural exports to Canada and Mexico triple and quintuple, respectively. One in every 10 acres on American farms is planted to feed hungry Canadians and Mexicans. With new market access and clearer rules afforded by NAFTA, U.S. services exports to Canada and Mexico have tripled, rising from $27 billion in 1993 to $82 billion in 2011. Canada and Mexico are the top two export destinations for U.S. small and medium-size enterprises, more than 122,000 of which sold their goods and services in Canada and Mexico in 2010.

#### NAFTA is a key labor demand

**Patton 10** (Oliver B., Washington Editor – TruckingInfo, “Mexico Raises Ante in Cross-Border Trucking Dispute”, *TruckingInfo*, 8/17/2010, <http://www.truckinginfo.com/news/news-detail.asp?news_id=71387>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

DOT's Progress Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has been working on a plan to revive cross-border trucking but so far nothing has emerged. He said last May that the White House was vetting a plan he hoped take to Congress for clearance in June. Yesterday DOT spokeswoman Olivia Alair said that the U.S. remains committed to working with Congress and Mexico to find a way forward. "We believe we can find a solution that both addresses the concerns voiced by some in the U.S. Congress, and keeps us compliant with our international trade obligations. The U.S. Department of Transportation is developing a new proposal that will meet congressional concerns as well as our NAFTA commitments." DOT does not have a schedule for when it will be able to announce the proposal, Alair said. Mexico did not name the products added to the tariff list but among them is pork, according to the National Pork Producers Council. Mexico bought $762 million worth of U.S. pork last year, the trade group said. "Mexico's retaliation against U.S. pork will have negative economic consequences for America's pork producers," said NPPC President Sam Carney. "We are extremely disappointed that our top volume export market has taken this action, but we're more disappointed that the United States is not living up to its trade obligations. That failure not only has hurt dozens of U.S. industries economically, but it could prompt other countries to think twice about entering into trade deals with the United States." Other Reactions U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said in a statement that the U.S. is disappointed by the Mexican move. "Mexico is an important U.S. export market and President Obama understands the economic pain that these tariffs cause for American farmers, companies and workers," Kirk said. "We are committed to continuing to work with members of Congress and our counterparts in Mexico to resolve the dispute and end these duties."

#### NAFTA opens trade- good for economy and relations

**Manzella 1992**

(John, Editor-in-Chief at The ManzellaReport.com, “Waking A Sleeping Giant—The Dawn of NAFTA,” The Manzella Report, 10-31-92, 7-10-13 http://www.manzellareport.com/index.php/trade-finance/455-waking-a-sleeping-giantthe-dawn-of-nafta)//KC

Under a North American Free Trade Agreement, investment access and property protection is expected to become more enticing. Thus, NAFTA legislation is anticipated to have a considerable impact on manufacturing in Mexico. The prospect of a North American Free Trade Agreement has given Mexico greater international credibility and abated investment fears. A NAFTA would offer Mexico secure access to U.S. and Canadian markets at a time when global protectionism is on the rise. This is extremely important Asian and European firms. Additionally, a NAFTA would somewhat tie the hands of future Mexican presidents preventing a political or economic policy turnaround. Thus, greater Mexican stability is key to American long-term planning and investing.

#### NAFTA solves for maquiladoras

**Manzella 1992**

(John, Editor-in-Chief at The ManzellaReport.com, “Waking A Sleeping Giant—The Dawn of NAFTA,” The Manzella Report, 10-31-92, 7-10-13 http://www.manzellareport.com/index.php/trade-finance/455-waking-a-sleeping-giantthe-dawn-of-nafta)//KC

NAFTA could reduce the incentive for U.S. owned factories to locate along the border. Similar to content requirements established under the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA content requirements stipulate that a minimum percentage of North American components must be incorporated in the finished products for that product to be considered a North American product. Once NAFTA is fully implemented, this status will allow these product to be traded in North America duty free. Whereas 9802.00.60 and 9802.00.80 permits only the U.S. content portion of the product to enter the U.S. duty free, NAFTA content rules will allow Mexican or North American products manufactured in Mexico to enter the U.S. entirely duty free even though North American components equal a minimum of 51% (62.5% for vehicles) of the finished product. Thus, the incentive to use U.S. components will be reduced. (U.S. firms currently supply 98% of materials and components used in maquiladora production). Consequently, the incentive to locate near the U.S.-Mexican border, close to traditional suppliers, is also reduced. Several other incentives exist for U.S. plants to move away from the border. For example, the maquila employment demand is expected to grow by approximately 10 to 20% each year. Currently, a shortage of labor, water, utilities, and housing exists in Mexican border towns. The border region can not sustain greater stress forced on its infrastructure or environmental degradation caused by new production facilities. Therefore, U.S. manufacturing firms considering establishing facilities in Mexico may be forced to locate in larger metropolitan areas. Under NAFTA, restrictions preventing U.S. maquiladoras from selling their products in Mexico will be eliminated. For this reason alone, manufacturers will consider locating closer to large consumer markets. With the exception of Mexico City, Monterey and Guadalajara, the Mexican government has eliminated location restrictions.

### NAFTA Bad

#### NAFTA not key to economies – economic disparities

**Wilson 13** (Timothy, “[Twenty Years Later: Accounting for NAFTA’s Wins and Losses](http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/nafta-mexicos-tech-spending-spree/),” *Nearshore Americas*, 3/25/2013, <http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/nafta-mexicos-tech-spending-spree/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

NAFTA Not a Magic Wand Despite the fact that there appear to have been significant macro-economic benefits, including increased technology investment, NAFTA certainly hasn’t been a magic wand – particularly with regard to rural poverty and income disparity in [Mexico](http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/tag/mexico). “A number of studies have found that NAFTA has brought economic and social benefits to the Mexican economy as a whole,” wrote M. Angeles Villarreal, specialist in International Trade and Finance, in a 2010 report to the United States Congress, “but the benefits have not been evenly distributed throughout the country.” In fact, in Villarreal’s opinion “the effects on the Mexican economy tended to be modest at most.”

#### NAFTA destroys the environment

**Cousins 13** (Farron, executive editor of The Trial Lawyer magazine, and his writings have appeared in publications such as California's Information Press and Pensacola's Independent Weekly.  He has also worked for the Ring of Fire radio program with hosts Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. and Mike Papantonio since August 2004, and is currently the producer of the program, in charge of guest booking, research, and scripting the week's show.  Farron also runs Mike Papantonio's publishing company - Seville Publishing. Farron received his bachelor's degree in Political Science from the University of West Florida in 2005 and became a member of American MENSA in 2009, “Could NAFTA Force Keystone XL On United States?,” *DESMOGBLOG*, 5/13/2013, <http://www.desmogblog.com/2013/05/13/could-nafta-force-keystone-xl-united-states>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

As the public anxiously awaits the U.S. State Department’s final decision on the fate of the Keystone XL Pipeline, the discussion has largely ignored the elephant in the room: the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA.) Thanks to NAFTA, signed into law by President Bill Clinton in 1994, the State Department will likely be able to do little more than stall the pipeline’s construction. [In its simplest form](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_American_Free_Trade_Agreement#Investment), NAFTA removes barriers for North American countries wishing to do business in or through other North American countries, including environmental barriers. The goal of the agreement was to promote intra-continental commerce and help the economies of all involved in the agreement. Before diving into NAFTA, it's important to take a look at what the State Department and the media have done so far in regards to Keystone XL. Before she left office and was replaced by John Kerry, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s ties to the project were almost too many to count. Most notable was the fact that [many of her former staffers and associates were lobbyists](http://www.desmogblog.com/hillary-clinton-keystone-xl-lobbyists) for Keystone, and they had a direct line into both Clinton and President Obama. It is likely a result of these connections that the State Department’s environmental assessments were [strikingly flawed and inadequate](http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/eshope/state_department_keystone_xl_e.html).  As the NRDC pointed out, many of the so-called “standards” that the State Department put in place regarding the pipeline were simple “[smoke and mirror” schemes](http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/eshope/state_department_keystone_xl_e.html) to distract the public, and they failed to do their due diligence by considering alternative paths for the pipeline. Furthermore, [climate impacts from operation and construction](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/04/17/1885621/keystone-pipeline-will-create-only-35-permanent-jobs-emit-51-coal-plants-worth-of-carbon/) were almost completely ignored. Compounding the problem of the State Department’s willingness to sign off on their own flawed environmental studies was the fact that the mainstream media was [more than willing to host Keystone XL proponents](http://www.desmogblog.com/media-matters-analysis-shows-keystone-xl-proponents-dominated-media) to tout the many “benefits” that America would experience by constructing the pipeline. Chief among those alleged “benefits” was the talking point regarding job creation. The media, as well as the public, bought into the industry’s talking points that [20,000 jobs would be created](http://www.desmogblog.com/bogus-job-numbers-used-sell-keystone-xl-pipeline) through construction of the pipeline. TransCanada eventually downgraded that number to 6,000 permanent jobs, but the media hardly paid attention. More recently, the fact that the pipeline would [create only 35 permanent jobs in America](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/04/17/1885621/keystone-pipeline-will-create-only-35-permanent-jobs-emit-51-coal-plants-worth-of-carbon/) was met by complete silence from the mainstream media, leaving the public woefully ignorant about the true “benefits” of the pipeline.  The other major talking point used to sell the pipeline was that it would reduce America’s dependence on foreign oil, and reduce oil prices for Americans. This talking point, while widely accepted again by both the media and the public, was completely at odds with reality. The reason TransCanada wants a pipeline from Canada to the Gulf Coast is so that the oil can be [refined and immediately loaded onto tankers](http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/aswift/keystone_xl_is_a_tar_sands_pip.html) to sell in overseas markets. This tar sands oil would not be staying in America, and therefore would not reduce our depedence on foreign oil. Furthermore, the fact that the oil would be sold overseas means that prices in [America would actually rise, rather than fall](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-22/keystone-xl-pipeline-will-raise-u-s-gasoline-prices-group-says.html), by as much as 12 cents per gallon. All of this misinformation helped convince the public that the pipeline is a great idea, as no major media outlets bothered to follow up and report the facts.  [Recent polls show that the majority of Americans](http://www.gallup.com/poll/153383/americans-favor-keystone-pipeline.aspx), including majorities of Republicans and Independent voters, favor construction of the pipeline. With all of these factors working in TransCanada’s favor, an approval from the State Department would seem to be an absolute certainty.   But if the State Department chooses to acknowledge the facts and prohibit the pipeline’s construction, TransCanada still has a fairly simply route to get it approved, and that’s where NAFTA comes into play. When it comes to the energy sector, [NAFTA has a lot to say](http://books.google.com/books?id=CQ1xKXGt4RQC&pg=PA350&lpg=PA350&dq=NAFTA+Article+609&source=bl&ots=kbVYs2bWPR&sig=iXbS2k5ionVM-phKUkyG6Ex6vug&hl=en&sa=X&ei=XfiOUa-5KpPQ8wSA_oCABQ&ved=0CFAQ6AEwBA#v=onepage&q=NAFTA%20Article%20609&f=false), and most of it isn’t good. At the heart of it, NAFTA mandates that member countries cannot discriminate against foreign energy companies.  This means that a Canadian energy company is legally allowed the same opportunities as American companies operating in the U.S. Since we’ve allowed our oil companies to construct pipelines, it would be illegal, in most circumstances, to deny that same privilege to TransCanada. Furthermore, [NAFTA significantly weakens the host government’s](http://www.piie.com/publications/chapters_preview/332/07iie3349.pdf) ability to restrict a project, even if that project would violate the government’s own regulations and standards. For example, [Exxon has been successful in bringing NAFTA challenges](http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/06/01/canada-nafta-exxon_n_1562996.html) to drilling projects that the Canadian government had denied the oil giant.

#### NAFTA forces illegal immigration

**AGUILAR 2012**

(JULIÁN, Reporter at Texas Tribune, “Twenty Years Later, Nafta Remains a Source of Tension,” The New York Times, 12-7-12, 7-10-13, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/07/us/twenty-years-later-nafta-remains-a-source-of-tension.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1)//KC

But unions and consumer-advocacy groups say Nafta has had negative effects in Mexico and the United States. They say that resulting outsourcing and lower wages have hurt the United States’ domestic economy and that Mexico’s rural industries have destabilized. As economists look to build on Nafta’s momentum to improve trade relations between member nations, critics say they should look to past failures to avoid similar mistakes in the future. Nafta, which was enacted in 1994, eliminated existing tariffs on more than half of the exports from Mexico to the United States and gradually phased out remaining tariffs between all member countries. The pact has benefited all three members. In 2010, the United States had $918 billion in two-way trade with Canada and Mexico, according to the office of Ron Kirk, United States trade representative. Economists say that progress has come despite enhanced global security measures following the Sept. 11 attacks and an eruption of drug-related violence in Mexico. During a recent symposium here, economists and policy makers celebrated Nafta’s success and brainstormed ways to build on it and bolster economic output. The symposium concluded with a clear message: the future is wide open. “We must continue to build upon Nafta and think more as a region in order to be more competitive globally,” said Gerónimo Gutiérrez, the managing director of the North American Development Bank, which was created by the governments of Mexico and the United States after Nafta’s inception and helps finance and develop infrastructure projects on the border. But critics of Nafta say it has resulted in a loss of United States manufacturing and shipping jobs and in less production oversight. They say Nafta has also displaced Mexican agricultural workers into other sectors or forced them to immigrate illegally to the United States. “There have been huge disparities in the number of people entering the work force and the number of jobs available,” said Timothy A. Wise, the policy research director at the Global Development and Environment Institute at Tufts University. “That resulted in the huge migration problem despite the increased enforcement.”

#### NAFTA causes rampant poverty in Mexico

**Perez-Rocha and Rojo 2013**

(Manuel and Javier, associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies and the coordinator of the Network for Justice in Global Investment. and the Institute's New Mexico Fellow, “NAFTA at 20: The New Spin,” 3-16-13, 7-10-13, truthour, http://truth-out.org/news/item/15152-nafta-at-20-the-new-spin)//KC

Rampant poverty in Mexico is a product of IMF and World Bank-led neoliberal policies—such as anti-inflationary policies that have kept wages stagnant—of which “free-trade” pacts like NAFTA are part and parcel. Another factor is the systematic failure to create good jobs in the formal sectors of the economy. During Felipe Calderon’s presidency, the share of the Mexican labor force relying on informal work—such as selling chewing gum and other low-cost products on the street—grew to nearly 50 percent. Even the wages in the manufacturing sector, which NAFTA cheerleaders argued would benefit the most from trade liberalization, have remained extremely low. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mexican manufacturing workers made an average hourly wage of only $4.53 in 2011, compared to $26.87 for their U.S. counterparts. Between 1997 and 2011, the U.S.-Mexico manufacturing wage gap narrowed only slightly, with Mexican wages rising from 13 to 17 percent of the level earned by American workers. In Brazil, by contrast, manufacturing wages are almost double Mexico’s, and in Argentina almost triple.

#### Free trade leads to decrease in food security – NAFTA proves

**Witness for Peace Southeast 13** (“Free trade promise has failed U.S., Mexico,” *Witness for Peace Southeast*, 2/19/2013,

<http://www.wfpse.org/free-trade-promise-has-failed-u-s-mexico/>, 7/9/2013, SLiu)

On Jan. 28, the Senate “Gang of 8” released its bi-partisan immigration blueprint, a day before President Obama announced a similar plan. The plan focuses on greater border security, a guest-worker program, heightened employer verification, and a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million undocumented people already in the country. It is past time for our policy makers to re-examine this failed system. If elected officials are serious about implementing comprehensive immigration reform, they will look to the root causes driving migration. As Sen. Marcos Rubio of Florida stated, without enforcement measures “we will be back in just a few years dealing with millions of new undocumented people in our country.” Sen. Rubio is correct: the flow of migrants will not cease. However, border enforcement will not keep people from risking everything to get to the United States. Fair and sensible U.S. economic policies will. In 1994, the U.S., Mexico and Canada organized the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Supposedly, increases in trade, foreign investment and exports would raise incomes and living standards. The goals were to reduce migration, create more and better jobs, and reduce prices for goods. These promises remain unfulfilled. Last May, I traveled to Oaxaca, Mexico, on a Witness for Peace Southeast delegation to explore reasons behind migration. We met with returned migrants and migrants traveling north. We stayed in a rural community where virtually everyone aged 20 to 40 had left home to find work. Time and again, we heard the same story: There is not enough work or food, and people must migrate to the U.S. to support their families. Those we met did not want to leave, but had no other choice. In Oaxaca, we witnessed the impacts of U.S. and international policies. U.S.-subsidized agriculture enables American corn to be sold at prices 30 percent below Mexico’s cost of production. The influx of cheap subsidized grains under NAFTA resulted in the loss of at least 2 million farming jobs. The jobs created by NAFTA to replace lost farming jobs are not sustainable. The average wage in Oaxaca is 7 pesos an hour – about 50 cents. In Oaxaca, we compared food prices at a local farmer’s market and a large supermarket chain. At a price of 100 to 120 pesos, buying one small chicken costs 15 hours of work. Food security is almost unattainable for many. Since 1994, the cost of the basic food basket in Mexico has risen 60 percent. Since 2001, an estimated third of manufacturing jobs created in Mexico have been lost as companies move their production orders overseas. The number of Mexicans migrating each year to the U.S. has more than doubled. As The News and Observer reported on Jan. 29, the number of undocumented people in the U.S. grew from 8.5 million in 2000 to 12.4 million in 2007. In North Carolina, undocumented migrants increased by 53 percent from 2000 to 2011. Clearly, the promises of NAFTA have failed both Mexico and the U.S. Our elected officials are right to address immigration as one of the most important issues facing our country. But the reality is that if people are unable to survive in their home countries, they will continue to migrate to the U.S. Slapping a Band-Aid on the symptoms will get us nowhere. If our officials are serious about tackling immigration, they will address the forces that contribute to migration in the first place. Renegotiating NAFTA is an ideal place to start.

### CAFTA Bad

#### CAFTA hurts small businesses

**George 10** (Tarun, “[Five Years Later, CAFTA Influence on Pro Services Outsourcing is Hotly Debated](http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/five-years-later-what-has-cafta-dr-really-done-for-professional-services-outsourcing/),” *Nearshore Americas*, 2/16/2010, <http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/five-years-later-what-has-cafta-dr-really-done-for-professional-services-outsourcing/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

He refers to Chapter 11 of the treaty which states that countries must accord the same privileges to service suppliers of other CAFTA countries as they do their own, and treat foreign investment the same as national investment. This standardization of rules across the board leaves US companies free to take advantage of low costs and local talent in Central America without fear of protectionism. CAFTA also provides increased legal and regulatory transparency. It requires many more certifications and licenses to set up a business, which gives investors greater confidence. The price and tax regimes are also clearer. “Under CAFTA you know exactly what the costs of your business will be, before you set up in a new country”, says Andy Efstathiou of [NelsonHall](http://www.nelson-hall.com/). “There are no nasty surprises”. And if a country doesn’t uphold its obligations, he mentions CAFTA’s impartial dispute settlement procedure through which companies can file cases separately from Central American courts. Unparalleled access – Chapter 11 of CAFTA gives US companies almost unrestricted access to Central American markets. Party countries may not limit the number of service suppliers or operations, the quantity of services output, the total value of service transactions, or the number of employees of a service supplier.

#### CAFTA hurts central American economies

**George 10** (Tarun, “[Five Years Later, CAFTA Influence on Pro Services Outsourcing is Hotly Debated](http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/five-years-later-what-has-cafta-dr-really-done-for-professional-services-outsourcing/),” *Nearshore Americas*, 2/16/2010, <http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/five-years-later-what-has-cafta-dr-really-done-for-professional-services-outsourcing/>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

The response is often quite negative in terms of CAFTA’s effect on Central America. The main criticism is that the treaty effectively hands these countries over to the multinational companies. Their unrestricted access to the Central American market has been a source of intense opposition since the treaty was introduced. “It affects the development model that countries can choose”, says Katherine Hoyt, Co-Director of the [Nicaragua Network in the Stop CAFTA Coalition](http://www.nicanet.org/). “The Asian Tigers’ model was to give certain sectors and companies preference over outside competition. But here if we try to protect small farmers and national goods and services, the multinationals can file lawsuits against the government”. The fact that US companies export products below the cost of production puts many people out of business and results in a huge rise in illegal immigration, she says. Central American companies themselves have a lot of unmet expectations for CAFTA. “Our companies thought they could bid on contracts in Texas, Florida and other US states, which is why many of them supported CAFTA at first”, says [Estuardo Robles,](http://www.outsourceguatemala.com/) Central American Business Development Analyst at [Zagada Markets](http://www.zagada.com/). “But I haven’t seen a single big government contract given to a Central American company”. He also mentions the current trade imbalance – countries like Guatemala and Nicaragua are importing much more from the US than they are exporting.

### CAFTA Good

#### CAFTA key to United States Credibility

**Weinstein 05** (Dr. Michael A., “Intelligence Brief: C.A.F.T.A.,” 5/24/2005, <http://lists.evergreen.edu/read/attachment/36818/1/htmlversion.html>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

"C.A.F.T.A. takes on special importance for Washington in the present conditions in world politics of a drift toward multipolarity. Historically an undisputed part of the U.S.' sphere of influence, Central America seems to be a natural place for Washington to consolidate and fill out the scope of its regional leadership. Failure to consummate C.A.F.T.A. would result in a loss of U.S. credibility, decreasing its influence in trade negotiations elsewhere and signaling that it cannot make good on its commitments. Already embroiled in disputes over immigration policy with Washington, Mexico City would be encouraged in its present southward turn, and the Central American states would be more open to economic and strategic penetration by other power centers, particularly the Brasilia-Caracas combine."

#### Solves regional instability – boosts economy

**Weinstein 05** (Dr. Michael A., “Intelligence Brief: C.A.F.T.A.,” 5/24/2005, <http://lists.evergreen.edu/read/attachment/36818/1/htmlversion.html>, 7/10/2013, SLiu)

Under pressure from publics threatened by economic competition from China, particularly in the textile sector, the administrations of the Central American states are counting on C.A.F.T.A. to stem job loss and bring in fresh investment, averting a recession that might bring them down and usher in left-populist governments. Strong left oppositions are waiting in the wings in El Salvador and Nicaragua, which has recently seen unruly street protests over economic concerns and which has been politically deadlocked by a confrontation between a left-right alliance of convenience in its parliament and President Enrique Bolanos.

### LAFTA Good

#### FTA to Latin America boosts the economy for both nations involved

Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada [Gov agency that manages Canada's diplomatic and consular relations, to encourage the country's international trade and to lead Canada’s international development and humanitarian assistance]¶ 2013-05-23¶ Executive Summary¶ <http://international.gc.ca/wet30-8/analysis-analyse/studies-etudes/canada_chile-canada_chili/econo_impact_exec.aspx>

The Canada-Chile Free Trade Agreement (CCFTA) entered into force on July 5, 1997, and was path-breaking in many respects for both Canada and Chile. For Canada, it was the first free trade agreement concluded with a major South American country and the most economically-significant trade agreement since the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). For Chile, it was the first comprehensive free trade agreement concluded with a leading industrialized country.¶ Fifteen years later, the CCFTA provides sufficient retrospective to assess what the agreement has achieved, and to what extent the agreement has delivered on its potential. During this period, there have been numerous developments in trade theory, regarding in particular the importance of variety and the impact of trade liberalization on new and existing products; hence, the CCFTA constitutes a source of empirical evidence on the significance of an FTA at the "extensive margin" (the introduction of new products into a trading relationship) as well as at the "intensive margin" (change in the volume of trade of currently traded products). Finally, Chile has been very active in signing FTAs since the CCFTA, completing 18 more FTAs after the CCFTA including those with the EU, the U.S., Mexico and China; in this regard, the CCFTA provides an interesting platform to assess the tariff preference erosion effect from the accumulation of FTAs.¶ In essence, the CCFTA delivered on its promises by allowing both countries to expand their bilateral trade significantly, both in terms of existing trade (intensive margin) and in terms of new trade (extensive margin), and to generate significant income gains:¶ a) On average, bilateral trade flows between the two countries grew 12.2 percent faster than would have been the case in the absence of the CCFTA;¶ b) Canadian exports to Chile grew by an average of 5.4 percent between 1997 and 2011, compared to only 1.7 percent for Latin America as a whole;¶ c) Chile became the third most important destination for Canadian exports to Latin America after Mexico and Brazil in 2011, compared to seventh in 1997;¶ d) The majority of trade gains came from new trade ? products that were not traded prior to the CCFTA and for which the CCFTA reduced the entry threshold. The new products accounted for 90 percent of the net increase in the value of Canadian exports to Chile.¶ e) The CCFTA generated benefits beyond the traditional benefits associated with tariff elimination. This suggests that measures to liberalize investment and services, which are common in today's new generation of free trade agreements, along with the added certainty following the trade deal, could have a significant effect on two-way trade in goods over and beyond the effect induced by lower tariffs.¶ f) Canada's overall economic welfare gains from the CCFTA were approximately a quarter of a billion dollars (or $250 million) annually; and¶ g) While Canada's market share in Chile rose after the implementation of the CCFTA, its preference advantages in Chile were eroded by subsequent FTAs between Chile and third countries.¶ The CCFTA is working as intended, encouraging greater trade between the two countries.¶ The value of Canadian exports to Chile more than doubled to reach $819 million in 2011 from $392 million in 1997, increasing at an annual rate of 5.4 percent during the past 15 years, and outperforming exports to other major South American countries such as Argentina and Brazil with which Canada did not have preferential trade arrangements. Over the same period, Canadian merchandise exports to the whole Latin American region grew only by 1.7 percent. As a result of this exceptional growth, Chile emerged as the third-most important destination for Canadian exports to Latin America only after Mexico and Brazil in 2011; whereas in 1997, Chile ranked only as the seventh-most important market in Latin America.¶ Growth of Canadian merchandise imports from Chile since the CCFTA was even more impressive. Total Canadian merchandise imports from Chile grew six fold to reach $1.9 billion in 2011 up from only $326 million in 1997. Even excluding precious metals, which accounted for roughly 50 percent of the total net increase in imports from Chile and were not targeted by the CCFTA, imports from Chile more than tripled.¶ Canada's export gains to Chile were broad-based and included ores, machinery and equipment, mineral fuels and oils, iron and steel products, plastics, animal fast and vegetable oils, chemical products, pharmaceutical products, precision and medical equipment, and tools of base metal, while import gains from Chile were concentrated in precious stones and metals, copper, fish, and edible fruits and vegetables.¶ Overall, the results of advanced econometric research indicate that, on average, bilateral trade flows between the two countries grew 12.2 percent faster than would have been the case in the absence of the CCFTA.

#### LA FTA’s boost their economies and lock in stable growth rates

[Oxford Analytica](http://www.forbes.com/business/2008/06/25/housing-oil-credit-biz_cx_0626oxford.html?feed=rss_business&partner=rss_myyahoo%20) [an independent strategic-consulting firm drawing on a network of more than 1,000 scholar experts at Oxford and other leading universities and research institutions around the world]¶ FTAs Benefit Latin America¶ 9/23/2008¶ <http://www.forbes.com/2008/09/22/latin-america-trade-cx_0923oxford.html>

Free trade agreements (FTAs) have increasingly proved beneficial for economic development in Latin America, but their success largely depends on the quality of implementation.¶ Since Mexico signed the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with the U.S. and Canada in 1992, other Latin American countries have followed suit, creating an ever more complex web of FTAs within and outside the region. This proliferation is expected to continue, particularly after the collapse of the Doha trade talks in July.¶ However, the region’s free traders view bilateral FTAs as only “third best,” after multilateral trade liberalization and regional integration. Moreover, some argue that bilateral deals create an obstacle to regional integration.¶ Growth Impact. FTAs are said to boost growth and employment; the Chilean government, for example, suggested that an FTA with the U.S. would boost the country’s medium-term growth by up to half a percentage point. But it is hard to isolate an FTA’s effect, especially during the global commodity boom of recent years.¶ An FTA’s impact on gross domestic product also depends on the response of foreign direct investment; in Latin America this has varied significantly. Higher FDI in Mexico post-NAFTA as companies sought to take advantage of preferential access to the U.S. market was seen as one of the main benefits of the deal–but other states have not done as well.¶ Long-Term Effects. A parallel argument suggests that the main benefits of FTAs in developing countries lie in their long-term qualitative effects, rather than short-term quantitative gains:¶ –Institutional and policy stability. FTAs, particularly with industrialized countries, and their prospective benefits provide a framework that helps to lock in pro-market structural reforms and, particularly, macroeconomic discipline.¶ –Environmental, phytosanitary and labor standards. FTA disciplines in these areas–although risking their use as non-tariff barriers–serve as an incentive for improvements that benefit local quality of life as well as long-term growth.¶ –Productivity. Competitive pressures on exporters and local producers faced with imported substitutes provide an incentive for the development or import of technology as well as for increased workplace training.

### LAFTA Bad

#### LAFTA failed – never achieved economic goals

Oneil 2012 (Shannon Oneil is the Douglas Dillon fellow for Latin America studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, 7-20-12, “Latin America: Trading and Investing Together”, <http://www.economonitor.com/blog/2012/07/latin-america-trading-and-investing-together/>)

Economic ties lead Latin America’s integration efforts. Promising some of the greatest concrete benefits—larger markets, improved livelihoods, and enhanced global economic power—leaders and communities alike have tried to integrate the region through three main means: trade, infrastructure, and investment. In the post-WWII era, governments began creating ambitious trade organizations, such as the 1960 Latin America Free Trade Association, or LAFTA, and its successor, the Latin American Integration Association, or ALADI. Both focused on (and never achieved) an integrated common market. Less ambitious (but more successful) have been the over fifty trade agreements negotiated over the past fifty years between Latin American neighbors, setting the stage for greater economic interchange.

#### FTA’s lack environmental standards- economic incentive to exploit the environment for profit

Global Exchange [Activism and news outlet dedicated to news on trade and globalization]¶ Top Ten Reasons to Oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement. 2011¶ <http://www.globalexchange.org/resources/cafta/oppose>

1. CAFTA Expands a Proven Disaster CAFTA would expand the failed NAFTA model of international trade to five additional Central American countries with plans to include the Dominican Republic already under way. But 10 years of NAFTA have shown just how devastating these agreements can be for working families and the environment. In the United States, over 766,000 jobs have been lost due to NAFTA. In the maquiladora zones along the US-Mexico border, wages are low, union organizing is suppressed, and industrial pollution has dramatically increased cases of hepatitis and birth defects among workers. NAFTA should be repealed, not expanded. 2. CAFTA Contains No Protection for Workers and the Environment CAFTA contains no meaningfully enforceable standards that might prevent countries from lowering their public health, workplace safety, and environmental laws in order to attract investment. Our experience with NAFTA has shown how corporations use this arrangement to pit workers in each country against one another in a “race-to-the-bottom” in wages and environmental protections. Trade agreements are presented to the public as a vehicle for economic development, but when these agreements fail to condition trade access on enforcement of international labor and environmental standards, only corporate CEOs see the benefits.

#### Latin American FTA crushes economies in the US and LA

Witness for Peace (WFP) [politically independent, nationwide grassroots organization of people committed to nonviolence, WFP’s mission is to support peace, justice and sustainable economies in the Americas by changing U.S. policies and corporate practices that contribute to poverty and oppression in Latin America and the Caribbean] (2011) Free Trade Agreements¶ <http://www.witnessforpeace.org/section.php?id=99>

For almost 20 years Witness for Peace has documented how free trade agreements like NAFTA and CAFTA have [exacerbated poverty and displacement](http://witnessforpeace.org/downloads/Fact%20Sheet_Unjust%20Trade%20and%20Forced%20Migration_2010.pdf" \t "_blank) in Latin America while U.S.-based corporations profit. Free trade agreements, a cornerstone of U.S. economic policy with Latin America, have devastating consequences for the environment, indigenous sovereignty, workers rights and the rural poor. For example, the influx of subsidized grains from the U.S. to Mexico under NAFTA decimated at least two million farming jobs. Now, every hour Mexico imports $1.5 million worth of food. In that same hour, 30 Mexican farmers migrate to the U.S. looking for work. Free trade also hurts working people in the United States. Agreements like CAFTA and NAFTA force U.S. workers to accept cuts to pay and benefits so that their employers can compete with low-wage factory producers south of the border. Millions of other workers have lost their jobs altogether as corporations moved overseas to build the same products with cheap foreign labor. [Despite this dismal record, the United States continues to use NAFTA as its model for trade agreements throughout the Americas.](http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/5436/p/dia/action/public/?action_KEY=6550" \t "_blank)

### FTAA Good

#### FTAA promotes trade

**Hidalgo 2012**

(Juan, Policy Analyst on Latin America at the Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity, “Building a Free Trade Area of Most of the Americas,” 10-31-12, CATO, 7-11-13, http://www.cato.org/blog/building-free-trade-area-most-americas)//KC

The United States should lead an effort to merge all these regional FTAs into one single Free Trade Area of the Americas for these nations willing to be part of it. The negotiations could also help to complete those missing links in the hemispheric trade jigsaw puzzle. And once achieved, this FTAA would leave the door open for other Latin American countries that might want to join in the future (the most likely candidates would be Uruguay and Paraguay given their growing dissatisfaction with Mercosur). Even though the United States wouldn’t gain much in terms of market access from such an FTAA, harmonizing trade rules along the continent would certainly help boost trade in the Americas. Moreover, the political cost would be minimal since Washington already has FTAs in place with all these countries.

### FTAA Bad

#### FTAA destructive- 8 warrants

**Ciepac No date**

(CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES

ECONÓMICAS Y POLÍTICAS DE ACCIÓN COMUNITARIA, ”The Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA),” http://www.ciepac.org/neoliberal/eng/ftaa.html)//KC

The easiest way to understand the effects that the FTAA would have is to look at what has happened in Mexico under NAFTA. All these effects have occurred in Mexico under NAFTA and would occur in all of America under the FTAA. Open borders. Countries can no longer protect their small businesses and farms by blocking cheap imports. These changes have already destroyed the jobs of more than 1.5 million campesinos in Mexico. The elimination of tariffs. Mexico has lost millions of dollars since 1994 by not taxing the products imported from the USA, money which would have been invested in the country’s development. Privatization. Healthcare, education, water, highways, ports, airports, electricity, natural resources and other things will be sold off to big companies, all on a big "shopping list." Costs of services go up and, at the same time, the earnings of the companies. Changes in national laws. Other countries would be forced, as Mexico has been, to change their laws and constitutions in order to make them more favourable to the interests of large corporations. Elimination of subsidies. While countries in Latin America are forced to eliminate their subsidies, the agricultural industry in the United States receives $10.1 billion per year in subsidies, which in turn help to crush the agricultural economies of Latin America. Violation of cultural rights. Corporations take control of the knowledge and land of indigenous people, and turn these things into earnings. Strong protection and rights for investors. Under NAFTA, countries can not impose conditions on international investors for the benefit of their people. Moreover, companies can sue national governments for loss of profits caused by any national law. Loss of food sovereignty. Cheap imports destroy a country’s capacity to produce the food needed to feed its population. See the explanation of NAFTA to learn more about this process in Mexico. Increase in poverty. Between 45% and 60% of the 800 million people in the region live in poverty. Close to 30% of the population lives off of agriculture. With diminished possibilities in rural areas, poverty will grow much more. Environmental degradation. Regions where big companies are the most active, like the border between Mexico and the United States and the maquiladora regions of Central America are the most polluted on the continent. Increase in migration. With the loss of jobs and possibilities in rural areas, many people will be obligated to migrate to cities or to the United States. Last year, around half a million Mexicans crossed the border to enter the US.